She has, therefore, requested for the grant of leave of Absence from 4th August, 2005 till the end of the current session of the Rajya Sabha.

Does she have the permission of the House for remaining absent from the sittings of the House from 4th August, 2005 till the end of the current session of the Rajya Sabha?

(No hon. Member dissented)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER REGARDING HIS RECENT OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (उत्तरांचल): धन्यवाद सभापति जी। सभापति जी, आज मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी के उस वक्तव्य पर चर्चा करने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूं, जो उन्होंने अपनी अमरीका यात्रा से लौटने के बाद 29 जुलाई, 2005 को इस सदन में दिया था।

सभापति जी, जिस समय प्रधान मंत्री जी यह वक्तव्य पढ़ रहे थे, तो उनके एक-एक शब्द पर कांग्रेस के सांसद मेज़ें थपथपा कर उनका स्वागत कर रहे थे, लेकिन पहली बार एक दृश्य देखने को मिला कि उनके सहयोगी दल इस खुशी में शरीक़ नहीं हो रहे थे। यहां तक कि वाम दल के साथी तो काफ़ी बुझे मन से बैठे थे। सभापति जी, मैं कहना चाहती हूं कि यदि इस वक्तव्य में कही गई बातें हक़ीक़त होतीं और तथ्यों पर आधारित होतीं, तो हम विपक्षी बैंचों में बैठने के बावजूद भी मेज़ें थपथपाते और प्रधान मंत्री जी का स्वागत करते। काश ऐसा हुआ होता, लेकिन ऐसा हुआ नहीं।

सभापति जी, यह जो वक्तव्य प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दिया, यह उस समझौते के बारे में दिया है, जिस समझौते पर उन्होंने 18 जुलाई को राष्ट्रपति श्री जॉर्ज बुश के साथ हस्ताक्षर किए थे और उसी समझौते की व्याख्या करते हुए यह वक्तव्य उन्होंने दिया है, लेकिन इसी समझौते की एक व्याख्या अमरीका में भी की गई। मैं प्रारम्भ में एक सच्चाई को स्वीकार करना चाहूंगी, प्रधान मंत्री जी, यदि इस समझौते की हमारी समझ और अमरीका की समझ एक-सी होती, समान होती, तो शायद विवाद की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं थी, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि जो व्याख्या आपने की है, अमरीका की व्याख्या उससे मेल नहीं खा रही और अमरीका की व्याख्या किसी ऐरे-गैरे ने नहीं की है, किसी छोटे अधिकारी ने नहीं की है, उनके विदेश उपमंत्री - निकोलस बर्न ने की है, जो कौंडलीसा राइस के डेपुटी हैं और इस समझौते को कराने में बहुत करीब से जुड़े रहे हैं और इसमें उन्होंने महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाई है।

सभापति जी, 18 जुलाई को यह समझौता हुआ और 19 जुलाई को, 24 घंटे के भीतर उन्होंने एक संवाददाता सम्मेलन बुलाकर उस संवाददाता सम्मेलन को सम्बोधित किया। उस संवाददाता सम्मेलन में उन्होंने क्या कहा, उसकी पूरी प्रति मेरे पास है, मैं केवल उसकी चार लाइनें पढ़ना चाहूंगी कि वे इस समझौते के बारे में अपने देश में क्या समझ बता रहे हैं। श्री निकालस बर्न ने कहा,

"What was significant about yesterday's agreement is that India committed itself in public, very specifically, to a series of actions to which it had not previously committed itself. Actions whih will, in effect, in *de facto* sense, have India agreeing to the same measures that most of the NPT States *have agreed to.*" यह निकोलस बर्न का स्टेटमेंट है और यह इस समझौते के बारे में अमरीका की अधिकृत समझ है, ऑफिशियल अंडरस्टेंडिंग है। हमारे यहा निजी चर्चाओं में यह कहा जा रहा है कि अगर एन.डब्ल्यू.ए. स्टेटस नहीं मिला तो क्या है, शब्द पर मत जाइए, हमें वह सब हासिल हो गया जो न्यूक्लियर वैपन स्टेट्स को मिलता है और वहीं निकोलस बर्न निजी चर्चाओं में ही नहीं, सार्वजनिक तौर पर कह रहे हैं कि एन.पी.टी. के शब्दों पर मत जाइए, भारत ने वह सब कुछ मान लिया है जो एन.पी.टी. के देश मानते हैं, यानी हम जिसे डीफेक्टो न्यूक्लिर वैपन्स स्टेट का दर्जा मान रहे हैं, उसे वे डीफेक्टो एन.पी.टी. की स्वीकार्यता मान रहे हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी, यह जो समझ का बुनियादी अंतर है, हमारी सारी चिंताएं इसमें से उपज रही हैं, हमारी सारी आपत्तियां इसमे से निकल रही हैं और इसलिए मैं सबसे पहले उस समझौते के उन पैराग्राफ्स को को पढ़ना चाहूंगी, ताकि सदन को यह बता सकूं कि इस समझौते में हमने दिया क्या और पाया क्या।

सभापति जी, मेरे पास उस समझौते की प्रति है। यह वह समझौता है, जिस पर प्रधान मंत्री मनमोहन सिंह एवं राष्ट्रपति बुश ने हस्ताक्षर किए इसके पृष्ठ दो के अंतिम दो पैराग्राफ्स में उन तमाम बातों का जिक्र है, जो हमने मानी और जो उन्होंने मानी। यह अंग्रेजी में है, पूरे का पूरा अंग्रेजी में पढ़ने के बजाय में बहुत ही सादी, सरल हिन्दी में आपके माध्यम से सदन को बताना चाहती हूं कि हमने क्या माना और उन्होंने क्या माना।

सभापति जी, हमने माना कि हम अपने सिविल न्यक्लियर और मिलिट्री न्यूक्लियर प्रोग्राम के बीच में सैपरेशन कर लेंगे, अर्थात् सामरिक व गैर-सामरिक जो परमाणु कार्यक्रम देश में चल रहा है, उसे चरणबद्ध तरीके से अलग-अलग कर लेंगे। दूसरी बात हमने क्या मानी, हम आई॰ए॰ई॰ए॰, इंटरनैशनल आटॉमिक एनर्जी एजेंसी के समाने एक डिक्लेयरेशन फाइल करेंगे। हमने तीसरी बात क्या मानी कि हम अपनी सारी सिविल न्यूक्लीअर फैसिलिटीज़ को आई॰ए॰ई॰ए॰ के सामने मॉनिटरिंग और इंस्पेक्शन-निगरानी और निरीक्षण के लिए रख देंगे। हमने चौथी बात क्या मानी कि हम एक और एडिशनल प्रौटोकॉल पर हस्ताक्षर करेंगे और उस पर पूरी तरह अमल भी करेंगे। हमने पांचवी क्या चीज़ मानी कि जो यूनिलेट्रल मोरेटेरियम जो एक एकतरफा प्रतिबंध हमारे न्यूक्लिअर टैस्ट पर चल रहा है उसको हम जारी रखेंगे। हमने छटी चीज क्या मानी कि NSG यानी न्यूक्लीआर सप्लार्यज़ ग्रुप और एम॰टी॰सी॰आर॰-मिसाइल टेक्नालॉजी कंट्रोल रिजीम के मेंबर तो नहीं हैं लेकिन बिना सदस्य बने, हम उनके सारे नियमों का पालन करेंगे। हमने सातवीं चीज क्या मानी - कि मल्टीनेशनल एफ॰एम॰सी॰टी॰-फिसाइल मेटीरियल कट आफ ट्रीटी को यू॰एस॰ के साथ मिलकर कन्क्लूड करेंगे, अमेरिका के साथ मिलकर कन्क्लूड करेंगे। ये सात चीजें हमने इसमें मानी।

अमेरिका ने क्या माना? अमेरिका ने माना कि वह अमेरिका के स्थानीय कानून और नीतियों में संशोधन करने का प्रस्ताव वहां की संसद यानी अमेरिकन कांग्रेस के पास ले जाएंगे। दूसरा क्या माना कि भारत के साथ व्यापार करने के लिए और भारत को सिविल न्यूक्लिअर कार्यक्रम में सहयोग देने के लिए मित्र देश भी आगे बढ़ें, इसके लिए मित्र देशों से बात करेंगे। तीसरी चीज क्या मानी कि भारत आई॰टी॰ई॰आर॰ में बहुत रुचि दिखाता है, भारत आई॰टी॰ई॰आर॰ में योगदान देने का इच्छुक है, इसलिए वह अपने सहयोगियों से बात करेंगे और हमारी इच्छा उनके सामने रखेंगे और चौथी चीज क्या मानी? चौथी चीज उन्होंने मानी कि भारत जेनिरेशन फॉर इंटरनेशनल फोरम का सदस्य बनने का इच्छुक है, तो इस इच्छा के बारे में विचार किया जाए, विचारार्थ वे अपने सहयोगियों से सलाह करेंगे। प्रधान मंत्री जी, अगर मैं गलत हूं तो मुझे यही बता दीजिए, ये सात चीजें हमने उनके सामने मानी, चार उन्होंने मानी। मैं आज भी अभी भी अपने तथ्य ठीक करने के लिए तैयार हूं अगर इसके अलावा हमने कुछ माना या हमने कुछ पाया। इन शर्तों का दुष्परिणाम क्या होगा, यह तो मैं बाद में बात करूंगी, पहले केवल शब्दों की बात कर रही हूं। मैंने जो 7 चीजें अपनी गिनाईं उन सबके पीछे क्या था-हम करेंगे,, करेंगे, करेंगे। और उनकी जो चार चीजें मैंने गिनाई उनमें क्या था? हम संसद के सामने जाएंगे और संसद नहीं मानी तो वे कुछ नहीं करेंगे। वे मित्र देशों से बात करेंगे, अगर मित्र देश नहीं माने तो वे कुछ नहीं करेंगे। वे हमारी इच्छा सहयोगी देशों के सामने रखेंगे और वह इच्छा अगर उन्होंने ठुकरा दी तो वे कुछ नहीं करेंगे। हमें आई॰टी॰ई॰आर॰ का मैम्बर बनाने के लिए वे पैरवी करेंगे, अगर वह पैरवी उनके पार्टनर्स ने नहीं मानी तो वे कुछ नहीं करेंगे यह है मोटा-मोटा समझौता। हार्ड कैश के बदले प्रॉमिसरी नोट लेकर आए हैं हम और प्रॉमिसरी नोट भी उस व्यक्ति ने साइन नहीं किया जो उसे अदा करेगा, बल्कि उस व्यक्ति ने साइन किया है जो दूसरों से अदा करवाने का प्रयास करेगा, वे कोशिश करेंगे, वे प्रयत्न करेंगे, वे सलाह करेंगे, वे विचार-विमर्श करेंगे। जब हम यह बात कहते हैं कि हार्ड कैश के बदले आप प्रॉमिसरी नोट लेकर चले आए और यहां आकर खुशी मना रहे हैं, गाना गा रहे है कि बहुत कुछ हासिल करके आ गए, तो हमें कहा जाता है कि आगे पढ़िए, उसमें एक रेसिप्रोसिटी क्लॉज भी है। हमने यह सारी चीजें मानी तो हैं मगर रेसिप्रोकल तरीके पर मानी हैं। वे करेंगे तो हम करेंगे, अगर वे नहीं करेंगे तो हम नहीं करेंगे, यह कहा जाता है। तो सभापति जी, रेसिप्रोसिटी क्लॉज देख लेते हैं रेसिप्रोसिटी के बारे में भी अगर हमारी और अमेरिका की समझ एक होती तो शायद मुझे गुरेज नहीं होता, लेकिन रेसिप्रोसिटी के बारे में जब निकोलस बर्न से पूछा गया तो उसी संवाददाता सम्मेलन में निकोलस बर्न ने कहा कि "The Agreement will not be put into effect tomorrow morning. It is going to take a series of impiementation commitments—it will have to be implemented by the Indian Government and then we will have to seek these changes from the Congress." आप इसे रेसीप्रोसिटी कहते हैं? सार्वजनिक तौर पर निकोलस बर्न यह कहते हैं कि पहले भारत सरकार यह कमिटमेंट करेगी, उसके बाद हम संसद के पास जायेंगे और यह केवल वह नहीं कहते, जो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्टेटमेंट दी है, मैं उसमें से एक

वाक्य पढ़कर सुनाती हूं। यह 29 जुलाई का स्टेटमेंट है। यह प्रधान मंत्री जी स्वयं कह रहे हैं। "We shall undertake the same responsiblities and obligations as such countries, including the United States, concommitantly we expect the same rights and benefits.

सभापति जी, अगर अंडरटेकिंग के बदले में एक्सपेक्टेशन रेसीप्रोसिटी होती है, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी को मुबारकवाद। मुझे नहीं मालूम, मेरा तो अंग्रेजी का ज्ञान बहुत सीमित है, उनके बराबर तो मैं मुकाबला कर ही नहीं सकती, उन्हें अंग्रेजी का, अर्थ-शास्त्र का सबका ज्ञान है। लेकिन शायद इतनी भर अंग्रेजी तो मुझे ज़रूर आती है कि अंडरटेकिंग के बदले में एक्सपेक्टेशन, कमिटमेंट के बदले में प्रोमिसेज़ और एग्रीमेंट के बदले में पॉसेबिलिटी, यह कम से कम रेसीप्रोसिटी की परिधि में नहीं आता है। आप शब्द की बात कहते हैं। सभापति जी, सारी की सारी कूटनीति शब्दों पर चलती है। डिप्लोमेसी तो नाम ही nuances का है। एक-एक कौमा, फुल स्टॉप कहां लगे, इसके लिए डिप्लोमेट्स घंटों बिता देते हैं हमारे समय में भी बहुत समझौते हुए, अमेरिका के साथ भी हुए, संयोग से वे दोनों विदेश मंत्री आज सदन में बैठे हैं, जिनके कार्यकाल में हुए। क्लिंटन-वाजपेयी विजन स्टेटमेंट सन् 2000 में जारी हुआ, जब जसवन्त सिंह जी विदेश मंत्री थे, एक एनएसएसपी, नेक्स्ट स्टेप टू स्ट्रेटजिक पार्टनरशिप, यशवंत सिन्हा जी के समय में जनवरी, 2004 में जारी हुआ, जब वे विदेश मंत्री थे। लेकिन हमने क्या लिखा, हमने जो शब्द चयन किया, हमने शब्द चयन किया, multilateral FMCT के बारे में, "we will work together" और जो मनमोहन सिंह जी, बुश के साथ समझौता करके आये, उसमें क्या लिखकर आये हैं. "We will work with the United States." मैं पढ़कर बताती हूं। हमने लिखा, "We will work together for early announcement of initiatives on a treaty to end the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons." और बुश जी के साथ डा॰ मनमोहन सिंह जी क्या लिखकर आये हैं, "We will work with the U.S. for the conclusion of a multilateral FMCT." क्या वर्क विद यू.एस. और वर्किंग टूगेदर का एक अर्थ होता है? सभापति जी, वर्किंग टूगेदर में कामरेडरी की भावना है, पैरिटी की भावना है और वर्क विद यू.एस. में सबमीशन और सबोर्डिनेशन की भावना है। आप एक धरातल पर खड़े होकर कहते हैं कि हम साथ-साथ काम करेंगे, एक दूसरे के कामरेडरी और एक दूसरे की पैरिटी आप स्वीकार करते हैं। यह हमारे समय में लिखा गया, उसी अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति क्लिंटन की यहां की वर्ष 2000 की विजिट में, जो क्लिंटन-वाजपेयी स्टेटमेंट जारी हुआ, उसमें हमने कहा, वी विल वर्क टूगेदर और आप लिखकर आये हैं, वी विल वर्क विद यू.एस.। मैं आपको बताऊं कि इसका दुष्परिणाम क्या होगा, यह आपने शायद उस समय समझा नहीं। यह इतनी बड़ी भयंकर भूल आप करके आये हैं, जो इतिहास में आपके नाम से दर्ज होगी। ...(व्यवधान)... मैं बताती हूं। आप शोर नहीं मचाइए, आप सुनिये, मैं आपको बताती हूं। यह वही भूल है, जैसी भूल पंडित नेहरू ने की थी, जैसी भूल पंडित नेहरू ने कश्मीर का मसला यू.एन. में ले जाने की थी, यह वैसी ही भूल है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मोती लाल वोरा (छत्तीसगढ़): कोई भूल नहीं थी।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: उन्होंने उस समय समझा था कि यू.एन. एक बड़ा फेयर प्लेयर होगा, इसलिए वह कश्मीर के मसले को युनाइटेड नेशन में ले गये, उसका खामियाजा हम आज तक भुगत रहे हैं। आज मनमोहन सिंह जी यह समझ गये कि यू.एस.यू.एन. का सबसिट्यूट हो सकता है। यह एफएमसीटी क्या है, Conference on Disarmament at Geneva का यह इश्यु है। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत का यह इश्यु है, इसीलिए मल्टीलेटरल एफएमसीटी की बात थी, एक मल्टीलेटरल चीज को आप बाई-लेटरली करके आ गये। आप यू.एन. की भूमिका से उसको यू.एस. की भूमिका तक ले गये। सभापति जी, सच्चाई तो यह है कि अपेक्षाओं, वायदों और सम्भावनाओं से भरा हुआ यह समझौता राष्ट्रहित के पूरी तरह खिलाफ है और यह बात मैं नहीं कह रही हूं। मेरे लिए तो वह कहेंगे कि आप विपक्षी बैंचों पर बैठी हैं, इसलिए आपको तो यह बात कहनी है, विरोध के लिए तो विरोध करना ही है। यह बात भाभा एटॉमिक रिसर्च सेंटर के फॉरमर डायरेक्टर ए॰एन॰ प्रसाद ने कही है। यह निजी चर्चा में नहीं, सार्वजनिक तौर पर कही है। सिद्धार्थ वर्धराजन एक पत्रकार हैं, उन्होंने उनसे बात की और उसके आधार पर एक राइट अप लिखा। डा॰ एन॰ प्रसाद ने क्या कहा है, मैं सिर्फ चार लाइनें पढ़कर बताती हूं। "I shudder to think how we could have conceded such a thing", Dr. A.N. Prasad, the former Director of BARC told this writer. "It is totally against the national interest". "India", he said, "would now face the prospect of its capital FDI programme being undermined and the cost of its nuclear programme dramatically escalated". सभापति जी, डा॰ प्रसाद ने यह बात भावावेश में नहीं बोल दी, वे इस प्रोग्राम से जुड़े रहे हैं। एक आणविक समझौते पर एक परमाणु वैज्ञानिक से बेहतर और प्रमाणिकता से कौन व्यक्ति बोल सकता है? जो बारीकियां हम नहीं समझते, वे डा॰ प्रसाद समझते हैं। उन्होंने जो यह बात कही है, वह इसलिए कही है क्योंकि वे जानते हैं कि हमारा आणविक हथियार कार्यक्रम हमारी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा से जुड़ा हुआ है। सभापति जी, हमारे दोनों तरफ ऐसे देश हैं - चीन और पाकिस्तान - जिनसे अतीत में हम युद्ध लड़ चुके हैं। आज युग बदल रहा है। हम शांति वार्ता की पहल कर रहे हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि पड़ौसी देश से रिश्ते अच्छे हों। हमने पहल की, अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी चाइना होकर आए, पाकिस्तान से भी उन्होंने बार-बार, असफल होने के बावजूद भी वार्ताएं जारी रखीं लेकिन वह अतीत हमें सावधानी बरतने के लिए चेतावनी देता है और यह उसी सावधानी का तकाजा है, यह उसी सतर्कता का तकाज़ा है कि हमारा सुरक्षा कवच किसी भी तरह से ढीला नहीं होना चाहिए और उसी सुरक्षा कवच को मजबूत करने के लिए 1998 में अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने पहल की थी 1974 में श्रीमती गांधी ने क्रूड ऐक्सप्लोसिव टेस्ट करवाया जो पोखरन-वन के नाम से जाना जाता हैं वह कार्यक्रम आगे नहीं बढ़ा, मैं आज बिल्कुल उन डिटेल्स, उन तफसीलात् में नहीं जाना चाहती कि वह आगे क्यों नहीं बढ़ा लेकिन इतना जरूर कहना चाहती हूं कि 1998 तक इतना आगे बढ़ गया था कि हमारे वैज्ञानिकों ने क्षमता जुटा ली थी। हां, परमाणु विस्फोट करने की अनुमति उन्हें नहीं मिल पर रही थी। लेकिन आज गर्व से, माथा ऊंचा करके इस सदन में खड़े होकर कह सकती हूं कि जब एनडीए की सरकार

आयी और श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी प्रधान मंत्री बने, चंद सप्ताह के भीतर उन्होंने वह फाइल क्लीयर की थी। ....(व्यवधान).... उन्होंने पोखरन विस्फोट की अनुमति दी थी। सभापति जी, अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने पोखरन विस्फोट की अनुमति इसलिए नहीं दी थी कि वे शांति में यकीन नहीं करते, इसलिए नहीं दी थी कि वे हिंसा के पक्षधर हैं, इसलिए नहीं दी थी कि वे देश को युद्ध की भट्ठी में झोंकना चाहते हैं बल्कि इसलिए दी थी कि वे जानते थे कि शांति की स्थापना के लिए शक्ति का संचय जरूरी होता है। राष्ट्रकवि दिनकर ने कहा था, ''कुरूक्षेत्र उनकी बहुत बड़ी रचना है और ये उनकी बहुत चर्चित लाइने हैं। उन्होंने कहा था:

क्षमा शोभति उस भुजंग को जिसके पास गरल हो,
उसको क्या जो दंतहीन, विषरहित, विनीत सरल हो।

अगर आप शक्ति का संचय करके बात करते हैं तो लोग समानता से बात करते हैं लेकिन अगर आपके पास शक्ति नहीं होती तो दूसरे आपको कमजोर समझते हैं। इसलिए यह कार्यक्रम किया गया था, इसलिए 1998 में इस कार्यक्रम को उन्होंने अनुमति दी थी लेकिन उस कार्यक्रम को अनुमति देने के बाद आज जब प्रधान मंत्री वहां गए तो हम लोगों को लगता था – क्योंकि वे कहकर गए थे कि मैं सेंसटाइज़ करने जा रहा हूं। हमें लग रहा था कि वे सेंसटाइज़ करके आएंगे कि हमारी भौगोलिक परिस्थिति समझिए, हमारे अतीत को देखिए और हमारा न्यूक्लियर में जिम्मेदाराना रिकॉर्ड देखिए। क्योंकि श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने यह बात पोखरन विस्फोट करवाने के बावजूद कही थी, हम पहला वार नहीं करेंगे। हम किसी भी गैर परमाणु सम्पन्न राष्ट्र पर वार नहीं करेंगे। यह बात भारतीय संस्कृति के युद्ध के नियमों से मेल खाती है। हमारे युद्ध के नियमों में लिखा है, हम कभी निहत्थे पर वार नहीं करते और शस्त्रधारी के साथ लड़ाई लड़ते हैं और उसका शस्त्र गिर जाता है तो शस्त्रधारी अपना शस्त्र गिराकर लड़ता है – ये हैं भारतीय संस्कृति के युद्ध के नियम। किसके तहत ये दो घोषणाएं उन्होंने की थीं? हमने देश को परमाणु शक्ति सम्पन्न राष्ट्र बनाया था लेकिन पूरी जिम्मेदारी से। हमें लगता था कि वे सेंसटाइज़ करके आएंगे तो न्यूक्लियर वैपन स्टेट का दर्जा भी लेकर आएंगे। लेकिन वे तो स्वयं डीसेंसटाइज़ होकर आ गए। वे तो वहां जाकर भूल गए कि राष्ट्र के हित की जरूरत क्या है, देश की सुरक्षा की आवश्यकता क्या हैं। पहले दिन खबर आयी थी, पता नहीं आपने वह पढ़ी या नहीं कि भारत को अमेरिका ने परमाणु सम्पन्न राष्ट्र का दर्जा दे दिया है। सच मानिए, बहुत खुशी हुई थी, बहुत ज्यादा खुशी हुई थी। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने इतनी बड़ी चीज हासिल कर ली, पलकें बिछाकर उनका स्वागत करेंगे। लेकिन अगले ही दिन अमेरिका की तरफ से क्लेरिफिकेशन आ गया, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि हमने उनको न्यूक्लियर वैपन स्टेट नहीं माना। हमने तो उनको माना है, a responsible State with advanced nuclear technology. मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि यह क्या है? मैंने फोन उठाया और जसवन्त सिंह जी को घुमाया। जसवन्त सिंह जी, मैं न्यूक्लियर वैपन स्टेट तो जानती हूं, लेकिन ये responsible State with advanced nuclear technology क्या होता है? इससे हमें क्या अधिकार मिले हैं? जैसा उनका स्वभाव है,

उन्होंने कहा कि अधिकार तो मिले हैं। मैंने कहा कि क्या मिले हैं? बोले कि जिस कमरे में न्यूक्लियर वैपन स्टेट्स की मीटिंग हो रही होगी, वहां बरामदे में बैठने का अधिकार आपको मिल जाएगा। मैंने कहा कि आप क्या कह रहे हैं? उन्होंने कहा कि ठीक ही तो कह रहा हूं, क्योंकि तुम अधिकार पूछ रही हो। तो बरामदे में बैठने का अधिकार होगा, मगर कमरे में झांकने की इजाजत नहीं होगी। जब हम पूछते हैं कि आप ऐसा क्यों करके आए? तो कहा जाता है कि हमारे पास minimum credible nuclear deterrent है क्या हर्ज है, अगर ईंधन के लिए, सिविल कार्यक्रम के लिए ये कमिटमेंट्स कर भी दिए जाएं तो इसमें परहेज क्या है? हमें यह कहा जाता है, यह बताया जाता है। सभापति जी, minimum credible nuclear deterrent एक रिलेटिव टर्म है। आपके हाथ में लाठी है तो मेरे हाथ की लाठी deterrent है। आपके हाथ में पिस्तौल है तो मेरे हाथ की बंदूक deterrent है, adequate deterrent है। लेकिन अगर आपके हाथ में एके-47 है तो मेरी 303 की रॉयफल deterrent नहीं है। आज हम पुलिस मॉडर्नाइजेशन पर हजारों करोड़ रुपया क्यों खर्च रहे हैं? क्योंकि हमारी सारी पुलिस फोर्स के पास 303 की राइफलें थीं, लेकिन जब आतंकवादी एके-47 लेकर आए,

[श्री उपसभापति पीठासीन हुए]

पहले कारबाइन लेकर आए, तो हम लोगों ने कहा कि नहीं, बदलिए ये राइफलें और इनको कारबाइन दीजिए। इनको कारबाइन से लैस कर दें। जब वे एके-47 ले आए तो हमने कहा कि जितने मर्जी करोड़ रुपया लग जाए, हमारे लोगों को, हमारी पैरा मिलिट्री फोर्सेज को एके-47 दीजिए। आज आतंकवादी एके-97 लेकर आ रहे हैं, तो हम कह रहे हैं कि एके-47 को बदलकर एके-97 करिए। हथियारों में आउट डेटिड, ऑब्सोलीट ये टर्म्स होती हैं, ये रेलेवेंट होती हैं। आप कहते हैं कि मिनिमम क्रेडिबल न्युक्लियर डेटेरेंट है। इसलिए आपको कोई भी कमिटमेंट कर देने से कोई गुरेज नहीं है। आप क्या कमिटमेंट करके आए हैं? मैंने कहा था कि इन शर्तों के, इन कमिटमेंट्स के दुष्परिणाम, मैं बताऊंगी। आप पहला कमिटमेंट करके आए हैं कि आप अपने सिविल और न्युक्लियर मिलिट्री प्रोग्राम को अलग-अलग कर दें। क्या यह इतना आसान होगा, कर पाएंगे आप, यह डा॰ प्रसाद से ज्यादा तो इसको कोई नहीं जानता। वे स्वयं अणु वैज्ञानिक हैं। मैं डा॰ प्रसाद का एक कोट पढ़कर सुनाती हूं, जो उन्होंने इस सेप्रेशन के बारे में कहा है, "Today, the Indian deterrent is maintained by incremental efforts for existing civilian nuclear facilities around the country and not just the two research reactors at BARC, Dhruva and Cirus. We produce what we need for the military programme at any given time and leave the rest for the civilian use. Having dedicated facilities will terribly raise the cost of the weapons' programme" उन्होंने यह कहा है। हमारा सिविलियन और मिलिट्री प्रोग्राम इतना इंटर लिंक्ड है, इतना ज्यादा इंटर लिंक्ड है, अगर मैं कहूं कि वह मां और बच्चे की नाल की तरह umbilical cord की तरह जुड़ा है, तो वह गलत नहीं होगा। आप जो फ्यूल सिविलियन फैसेलिटी में डालते हैं, उसके वेस्ट से आप

मिलिट्री प्रोग्राम चलाते हैं। आपके जो साइंटिस्ट सिविलियन क्षेत्र में काम करते हैं, वही साइंटिस्ट मिलिट्री में काम करते हैं। दो प्रोग्राम अलग-अलग नहीं हैं। मैंने जसवन्त सिंह जी से पूछा था कि क्या हम इसको अलग कर सकते हैं, तो उन्होंने कहा कि eventually अलग कर पाएंगे। eventually तो umbilical cord भी टूटती है, उपसभापति जी, लेकिन कब टूटती है? जब बालक गर्भ में 9 माह का हो जाता है। जब वह स्वयं खाने-पीने लगता है। उस समय स्वयं डाक्टर आकर तोड़ता है umbilical cord को, और अलग-अलग करता है मां और बच्चे को। लेकिन अगर कोई आकर के कहे कि दबाव में यह umbilical cord काट दो तो बच्चा तो मरता ही है साथ में मां को भी खतरा पैदा हो जाता है आपने eventually की बात नहीं की है, आपने डेड लाइन सैट कर दी है। आपने कहा है कि इन कमिटमेंट्स का रिव्यू तब होगा जब प्रेजिडेंट बुश यहां आएंगे। प्रेजिडेंट बुश 2006 में यहां आएंगे, मगर दिसम्बर 2006 में नहीं आएंगे। उनकी यात्रा की जो तारीखें तय हो रही हैं वे जनवरी से मार्च के बीच तय हो रही हैं। अगर मैं मार्च भी लेकर चलूँ तो कितने महीने हैं आपके पास? अगस्त में हम खड़े हैं, सितम्बर, अक्तूबर, नवम्बर, दिसम्बर, जनवरी और फरवरी। अगर वे जनवरी में आ गए तो केवल चार महीने? क्या इतने प्रेशर में आप इस सिविल मिलिट्री प्रोग्राम को अलग कर पाएंगे? निकोलस बर्न ने पहले ही कह दिया और कल फिर एक अखबार में दोहरा दिया कि पहले आप कमिटमेंट पूरी कीजिए, फिर हम संसद के पास जाएंगे। उनका कहना स्वाभाविक भी है, क्योंकि अमरीकी संसद ऐसे ही पास नहीं कर देती। वह पूछेगी, बताइए, भारत सरकार ने कितनी कमिटमेंट पूरी की। तब तो वह संसद में प्रस्ताव स्वीकार करने के लिए लेगी, उस पर सहमति देगी कि नहीं इस पर तो सवालिया निशान लग रहा है। आपने तो डेड लाइन सेट कर दी और कह दिया कि आप इसे उस समय रिव्यू करेंगे, जिस समय राष्ट्रपति बुश आ रहे हैं। लेकिन निकोलस बर्न खुद सितम्बर में आ रहे हैं, सितम्बर में आकर वे आपसे पूछेंगे कि आने के बाद आपने कितनी प्रगति की। सेपरेशन का यह जो प्रोग्राम आप मानकर आए हैं, यह हमारे पूरे मिलिट्री प्रोग्राम को धराशायी कर देगा, ध्वस्त कर देगा।

दूसरी बात आपने मान ली, वह यह कि आप आई॰ए॰ई॰ए॰ के सामने अपनी सारी सिविल न्यूक्लियर फेसिलिटीज मोनिटरिंग और निरीक्षण के लिए रख देंगे। उपसभापति जी, फेसिलिटीज का मतलब केवल रिएक्टर नहीं है। आपको मालूम है निगरानी और निरीक्षण किसका होगा। वे पूरे सिविल न्युक्लियर फ्यूल साइकल की मोनिटरिंग करेंगे। जो यूरेनियम माइन्स से शुरू होता है और न्यूक्लियर रिएक्टर तक पहुंचता है, वे यूरेनियम माइन्स की इंस्पेक्शन करेंगे, फ्यूल फेब्रिकेशन प्लान्टस का निरीक्षण करेंगे, स्पेंट फ्यूल स्टोरेज की इंस्पेक्शन करेंगे, न्युक्लियर रिएक्टर्स की इंस्पेक्शन करेंगे। मैं पूछना चाहती हूं, हमारे यहां जो पंद्रह रिएक्टर्स हैं, उनमें से पांच ऑलरेडी आई॰ए॰ई॰ए॰ के सेफगार्ड्स में हैं, आप तय कर लेते कि जो बाकी के भविष्य में लगेंगे, अमरीका की मदद से लगेंगे, उनको हम आई॰ए॰ई॰ए॰ के सेफगार्ड्स में डाल देंगे, लेकिन बाकी के दस रिएक्टर्स, जिनमें अमरीका का धेला नहीं लगा, जिसमें अमरीका की राई, रत्ती तकनीक नहीं लगी, वह हमारे वैज्ञानिकों की जमा पूंजी है, उनकी बौद्धिक संपदा है, आप उस जमा पूंजी को क्यों गिरवी

रख आए? आप हमारे वैज्ञानिकों का किया धरा क्यों पानी कर आए? आपने यह शर्त कैसे मान ली? फिर आपने मान लिया कि आप एडीशनल प्रोटोकॉल साइन करेंगे। क्या है यह एडीशनल प्रोटोकॉल? आपने खुलासा नहीं किया हैं आपने कहा कि मानेंगे भी, साइन भी करेंगे, एडहियर टू, अमल भी करेंगे। उस एडीशनल प्रोटोकॉल के प्रावधान क्या होंगे? अगर यह एडीशनल प्रोटोकॉल मॉडल प्रोटोकॉल होने वाला है तो मैं आपके माध्यम से सदन को चेतावनी देना चाहती हूं कि बहुत भयंकर प्रावधान मॉडल प्रोटोकॉल के हैं। आप जानते हैं मॉडल प्रोटोकॉल सिविल और मिलिट्री के बीच में एक फायर वॉल खड़ी करता है। वह यह कहता है कि आप मैटीरियल तो छोड़िए, अपना ह्यूमन रिसोर्स भी ट्रांसफर नहीं कर सकते। यानी अगर आपके सिविल न्युक्लियर फेसिलिटी पर कोई एक तकनीशियन, कोई इंजीनियर आज काम कर रहा है और आप चाहें कि कल उसका तबादला करके आप मिलिट्री में भेज दें तो आप नहीं भेज सकते। आप वह भी नहीं भेज सकते हैं। क्या आप ऐसा मॉडल प्रोटोकॉल साइन करेंगे? जब बुश ने यह गुंजाइश रख ली थी कि मैं संसद में जाऊंगा, संसद से पूछूंगा तो आप यह गुंजाइश क्यों नहीं रख पाए? भारत विश्व का इतना बड़ा लोकतंत्र है, भारत संसदीय जनतंत्र का प्रतीक है, आप भी कहते कि मैं अपनी संसद से पूछूंगा। संसद का सत्र होने वाला था। आप यहां वापस आए, 18 तारीख को आपने साइन किया, 25 से संसद का सत्र शुरू हो गया। उन्होंने अपनी संसद की मर्यादा रख ली, लेकिन आप संसद छोड़िए, आप अपने कैबिनेट से भी पूछकर नहीं गए। बताइए, क्या आपने कैबिनेट की मीटिंग बुलाई थी और यह चर्चा की थी? क्या आपने सी॰सी॰एस॰ (केबिनेट कमेटी ऑन सिक्योरिटी) की मीटिंग बुलाई थी, यह उसमें चर्चा की थी? क्या आपने सी॰सी॰पी॰ए॰ (केबिनेट कमेटी ऑन पोलिटिकल अफेयर्स) की मीटिंग बुलाई थी, उसमें चर्चा की थी? क्या आपने वरिष्ठ सहयोगियों से चर्चा की थी? मेरी तो जानकारी है कि आपने अपने वरिष्ठ सहयोगियों से भी बात नहीं की। क्या आपने घटक दलों से बात की थी? आपने अपने सहयोगी दलों तक से बात नहीं की। ...(व्यवधान)... और आप यह करके चले आए ...(व्यवधान)... प्लीज,, प्लीज ...(व्यवधान)... आपने किसी से बात नहीं की। बिना किसी से बात किए हुए आप चार अधिकारी साथ ले गए और उन चार अधिकारियों के साथ बैठकर आपने सौदा कर दिया, उन चार अधिकारियों के साथ बैठकर आपने समझौता लिख दिया। मैं पूछना चाहती हूं कि यह समझौता करने के बाद आपको मिला क्या? आप तो सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल का दावा लेकर गए थे, बहुत उम्मीदें जताकर गए थे कि सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में आपकी दावेदारी की बात अमरीका मानेगा, लेकिन आपके मुंह पर उसने ''ना'' कर दी। यह ठीक है कि आज से पहले भी कभी अमरीका ने ''हां'' नहीं कही थी, लेकिन ''ना''करने की हिम्मत भी वह नहीं जुटा पाया था वह यही कहता थे- ''देखेंगे, कर रहे हैं, देख रहे हैं, बात करेंगे, आपका दावा तो है, अच्छा है, आप ग्लोबल पावर भी हैं, emerging power भी हैं, हम आपके दावे के बारे में सोच रहे हैं,'' लेकिन आपको तो उन्होंने सीधी-सपाट ''ना'' कर दी और दूसरे देश का नाम भी घोषित कर दिया जिसको सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल के लिए वे समर्थन देने वाले हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि हम तो जापान का साथ देंगे।

डा॰ मनमोहन सिंह, पंजाबी की एक कहावत मैं आपको बताना चाहती हूं-

''दुनिया मनदी जोरा नूं, लख लानत है कमज़ोरा नूं।''

अगर दुनिया झुकती है तो ताकतवर के आगे झुकती है।

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir): It is unparliamentary because it has a reference. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: दुनिया ताकतवर के आगे झुकती है, कमज़ोर के आगे नहीं झुकती, कमज़ोर की तो बात भी नहीं मानती।

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: You have quoted wrong words. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: उपसभापति जी, कहावत पंजाब के गांव-गांव में कही जाती है, वह मैंने कही है, मैंने केवल कहावत कही है। मैं आपको बताना चाहती हूं कि केवल ताकतवर की बात दुनिया सुनती है। अमरीका का ह्यूमन राइट्स में क्या ट्रैक रिकॉर्ड है?

PROF. SAID-UD-DIN SOZ: It should not go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: उपसभापति जी, मैं इस सदन में खड़े होकर पूछना चाहती हूं कि ईराक और पाकिस्तान में तबाही मचाने के बावजूद अमरीका ह्यूमन राइट्स का पैरोकार बनता है, मानवाधिकारों का पैरोकार बनता है। पाकिस्तान को बेतहाशा हथियारों से लैस करने के बाद, पाकिस्तान निरस्त्रीकरण का पैरोकार बनता disarmament की दुहाई देता है। पाकिस्तान से पींगें बढ़ाने के बाद, वह डेमोक्रेसी की बात करता है, आतंकवाद से लड़ने की बात करता है। तालीबान जैसे भस्मासुर पैदा करने के बाद वह टैररिज्म से लड़ने की बात करता है, लेकिन कौन पूछे उससे? कोई नहीं पूछता, कोई नहीं जान सकता, क्यों?''समरथ को नहिं दोष गुसाईं'' - वह समर्थ है, वह ताकतवर है, तो आप भी कम ताकतवर नहीं हैं। मुझे नहीं मालूम कि पार्टी में आपकी ताकत क्या है, क्या नहीं, वह आप जानें, वह आपकी व्यक्तिगत हैसियत है, लेकिन जब आप एक प्रधानमंत्री के नाते जाते हैं, तो आप 100 करोड़ के देश के प्रधानमंत्री हैं। जब आप जाकर भारत का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं, तो 100 करोड़ से ज्यादा लोग आपके पीछे कतार बांधकर खड़े रहते हैं, आप क्यों कमज़ोर पड़ गए? आप एक ऐसा समझौता करके आए हैं, जो समझौता इतिहास में इस तरह से लिखा जाएगा कि आने वाली पीढ़ियां ''किन्तु'' और ''परन्तु'' करते हुए उलझ जाएंगी, पहले तो आप स्वयं उलझेंगे, जब अमरीका आएगा और जब उनके रिप्रैजेंटेटिव बैठेंगे तो आप कहेंगे - "No I didn't mean this, I meant that. मेरा मतलब यह नहीं था, मेरा मतलब यह था, आपने गलत समझा, हम तो यह कहना चाहते थे।'' जो चीजें आप मानकर आए हैं, आने वाली पीढ़ियों के लिए इसमें से

निकलना मुश्किल हो जाएगा। मैंने कहा कि भयंकर भूल के तौर पर यह दर्ज़ होगा। जब big blunders लिखे जाएंगे, उन big blunders के तौर पर यह दर्ज़ होगा। सरदार मनमोहन सिंह, मैं आपसे कहना चाहती हूं कि अगर आप विश्व में अपनी हैसियत बरकरार रखना चाहते हैं, तो अपनी ताकत, अपनी शक्ति और अपनी सामर्थ्य को बचाकर रखिए। मुझे यह बात कहते हुए गर्व है कि हमने उस सामर्थ्य को जुटाने में बहुत बड़ी भूमिका अदा की है, आप इस सामर्थ्य को बरबाद मत करिए, वरना आने वाली नस्लें केवल आप पर नहीं बल्कि हम पर भी फब्तियां कसेंगी और हमको भी कोसेंगी। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I stand up with a sense of pride; I also stand up with a sense of history unfolding itself before our eyes, this particular day and time in India. From a regional power, to a power on the threshold of being a global player, it would make any Indian proud. I stand up to applaud the Indian Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh for successfully having brought us out from a position of isolation, from a position of boycott on purchase of nuclear fuel to this that on a reciprocal basis, as two equal sovereign powers, India signed a joint communique with the United States of America. Debate is healthy. We are believe that debate is an important ingredient of a mature democracy. But when it degenerates into recrimination, abuse and street rhetoric, then, it only reflects bankruptcy, of political thought and sincerity. Hearing Sushmaji, I was wondering, as a responsible political leader of a political party, the tone she chose to speake on an important issue like Indo-US relations and their evolution. I would not like to take the debate away from the actual content, the impact both on India and the United States of America and if Mrs. Sushma Swaraj chooses not to see that impact and remain confined to the mould of her political environs, she is refusing to hear the voice of those Indians who are wanting to grow out of their small huts, their hovels in suburban areas; those 65 per cent of India's youth who are looking forward to further employment opportunities, who are looking forward to growth with dignity and respect, of being called the proud citizens of a proud country. Acrimony, political posturing, we can all understand, we represent different political points of view. Rancour and recrimination, an attitude of grapes being sour, hardly speaks of one's deeper understanding of international affairs. Though recently, at the release of Mr. Amartya Sen's book by the Prime Minister, he (Amartya Sen) did put before, us, that India's strength is a democracy, but this has been marked by a tradition of argumentation! Now, I cannot call senior BJP leader like Sushma Swaraj just argumentative. But the way she addressed this whole visit of the Indian Prime Minister to the United States of America,

makes me remember an election which took place in Bellary long time ago. When I used to campaign behind Mrs. Sushma Swaraj and used to hear her speeches in Kannada, I was always wondering when Sushmaji had learnt her Kannada. Then I was told by people that she has five speeches readymade which she has learnt by-heart and recites them according to the occasion. Today the way she quoted...*(interruptions)*...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बैठिए।

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: Today the way she was quoting an ex-official of the atomic...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: आप एक लाइन याद करके सुना दीजिए।

श्रीमती अम्बिका सोनी: मैं तो करती हूं। मेरे पास तो कागज है, मैं पढ़ रही हूं, मैंने खुद लिखा है।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: पांच लाइन की स्पीच है, आप एक लाइन पढ़ कर सुना दीजिए।

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: Today when she was quoting ad-nauseam an erstwhile person who worked in the Atomic Energy, I could not gather, Mr. Prasad or somebody, one would imagine that he according to his thinking wrote out what she said or we had distributed to the media a backgrounder for media where we took up all the questions raised by Sushmaji here and gave lengthy, factual answers according to what transpired. She has spoken of every point. Maybe, she has a copy of this and this was her base paper. But, this was prepared by the Prime Minister's Office for the media and we circulated that. One-by-one, you did cover all these points. But, if you have this paper, then, you should have the answers from the paper itself. Sushmaji, I would like you to remember that, today, when you address the Prime Minister of India, you are not just addressing Dr. Manmohan Singh. Dr. Manmohan Singh is the proud inheritor of the legacy of the Indian National Congress. You would, propably, not understand how proud all of us feel sitting on this side of the House when we think of Lala Lajpat Rai, when we think of Subhash Chandra Bose, when we think of Maulana Azad and Jawaharlal Nehru when we think of all those stalwarts who gave up their lives for India's freedom. Dr. Manmohan Singh comes from that party. This party's history is replete with sacrifices and martyrdom. You, probably, would not understand that. I don't want to become small and talk of papers of 1942! I will not do that ...*(Interruptions)*... But, let us remember that this party which, today, Dr. Manmohan Singh proudly represents as the Prime Minister of India, is replete with the martyrdoms of Mahatma Gandhi, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi. No ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री उपसभापति: पुंज जी, देखिए अब जब ...(व्यवधान)... मेहरबानी कर के बैठिए। देखिए, debate is going on. वह जब सुनते हैं तो आप को भी उन की बात सुननी चाहिए।

डा॰ छत्रपाल सिंह लोधा (उड़ीसा): यह क्या बात कर रहे हैं, प्रधान मंत्री जी की यात्रा के संबंध में बात करवाइए। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ (Uttar Pradesh): What are we discussing here? ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री उपसभापति: आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि वह क्या बात कर रहे है। आप बैठिए।

श्री सुरेन्द्र लाठ (उड़ीसा): सर, बल्लारी की बात की जा रही है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बैठिए, बीच में interrupt मत कीजिए, सुनिए बस।

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: Sir, this party has never compromised with patriotism ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री उपसभापति: आप क्या बात कर रहे हैं, जब यहां से आप के नेता बोल रहे थे तो वह सुन रहे थे, अब आप को भी उनको सुनना पड़ेगा।

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: This Indian National Congress has never compromised with communalism. This party, the Indian National Congress, has always given its life, its leaders have given their lives, for the prestige of the INC and the Flag of India.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): How is it related to the Prime Minister's US visit? ...*(Interruptions)*... What is she speaking? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: Are you, therefore, saying, as you said ...*(Interruptions)*... In a Parliamentary democracy you said ...*(Interruptions)*... You know, you are shouting only to say that I am hurting and it was my intention to hurt you for having said that what Dr. Manmohan Singh said in both the Houses of Parliament in his statement about his trip was not based on facts. You wanted to say that it was not the truth. I want to tell you that this party does not compromise with national prestige. That is not our history. If you find yourself comfortable in those surroundings, you better answer it to yourself. Sir, Mrs. Sushma Swaraj, as I said, has raised several issues which I am not really going to reply to and I do not want to be repetitive by answering them that it is a reciprocal statement signed. This visit was to sensitise American opinion as the Prime Minister said on the changes which have taken place in Indian since 1991. I do not even want to repeat at length the impact, the priority given to our effort to globalise our combating terrorism not selectively or in segmentation but globalising it. I do not want to mention that we have never compromised

with terrorism. We have never gone to Kandhar taking terrorists. That is not our record. I also want to say that Sushma Swaraji was trying to tell us that nuclear deterrent is a very relative term. Thank you for telling us. We would not have known! When we are sensitising American opinion on changes which have occurred since 1991 to date then we also know that the world is moving on. But, I read an article just a couple of days ago. That article had in it a few facts and figures, which I might like to repeat. They talk of the Hiroshima bomb which was dropped, that it was 15 kilo tonnes and could destroy 1.8 to 4.8 million people. According to whatever is public knowledge about India's nuclear capacity, we have a capacity -- God forbid, it should never arise -- to, probably, put an end to the lives of 300 million to 800 million people. Now, if that is not a deterrent, then, I do not know what could be a further increase in this. But Sushmaji dwelt at a great length on this. And, I would like to say that there are three kinds of people in this country — a small minority, articulate, vocal — which feel that they don't need a deterrent at all. But their voice is still not heard. There is another minority of our population that feels that deterrence and arsenals should be increased, and the world only respects those who have nuclear warheads! Sushmaji just said that herself. But a large majority of the population of India, while feeling extremely proud about India's nuclear capacity, about the deterrent we may have, wants to go on with life and wants the development to go on. These are people who have to be heard. It is hearing these people that Dr. Manmohan Singh had other items on the agenda of his visit also. The items of the agenda were: Our knowledge and services in information technology, agricultural cooperation, captains of business and industry from the United States of America and India forming forum, addressing the Joint Session of Congress, and putting the case of India for membership of UNSC loudly and clearly before them. She was reminding us that India is one billion people. Dr. Manmohan Singh, while addressing the Joint Session of Congress, said, "India represents one billion people, and the world cannot afford not to hear them in international fora." And, they applauded his statement. So, you don't need to remind India's Prime Minister today that he has the mandate but he hears the voice of only a few. He is working for all those people who are looking forward to development; want money and resources to be diverted to progress, to infrastructure, and other such needs which Indians feel will make them have a level-playing field. Sushmaji also said that we have lost more than what we have gained. I don't know which statement she read because, obviously, we are reading different statements. I have, before me, the statement that the Prime Minister made in the House. I read and

heard what the Prime Minister said in the Lok Sabha yesterday. And, she was saying that we have only agreed to do, we have only accepted the role of an obedient slave, while the others are only making promises. I read newspapers yesterday and today. I read articles written by Americans, as she is fond of quoting them, that the US Administration has already begun moving in the direction of what they have talked of with the Indian Prime Minister and his delegation. They have already taken off several organizations, from the Entities list, which were till now barred from trading and importing technology. So, they have begun with it. It is a difficult job. It is not an easy job to get the US Congress to change and dismantle the entire NPT set-up. As I understand, as a layperson, it is only the commitment to treat India as an important player in global affairs, recognizing the role India has played in the recent years that they are willing to take on what many people feel will be difficult task. But I trust the Prime Minister of India. I believe in what he has said. He would not misguide this House when he says that all this is reciprocal, mutual and to be reviewed. If the United States is not able to come up to what they have promised, we are absolutely within our right to go back and to withdraw from any of the commitments we have given. That is in sum and substance what he has assured us, and there is no reason to disbelieve. Let time unfold how this exercise will work. You talk of having given up the pride of India, having taken up a subservient role. I don't know what was the reason for the BJP, to field Sushmaji today instead of Jaswant Singhji, or Yashwant Sinhaji. Maybe, they all would have thought that we are going to use this book of Strobe Talbot extensively. So, they didn't put either of them up, but I don't want to go into all that. I would like to talk of how many leaders of the NDA, while on a visit to the United States of America, were able to stand up and loudly state for the entire USA audience to hear that what happened in Iraq should not have happened, and what happened in Iraq should never happen again. That was what Dr. Manmohan Singh, the Prime Minister of India, spoke categorically. It was the Prime Minister, who was never engaged by the U.S. Administration in any discussion on Iran-Pak-India Gas pipeline, but spoke in answer to a correspondent's query that this agreement was between sovereign nations; no other nation has a right to interfere. You talk of him having taken up a subservient role? I would not like to remind at whose behest an Indian Airlines plane went to Kandhar and compromised the lives of those who have been the victims of those known terrorists, whom you escorted out of the boundaries of this country ... *(Interruptions)*... I do not want to go into the details of this book, but thanks to the Foreign Minister, I read it and the areas are marked, where we gave categorical

assurances to sign the CTBT without getting anything in return. You are talking that they have given us promissory notes and we are going to fulfil our part of the commitment as an obedient servant. I don't know why, Sushmaji. You are a very enlightened leader. Many of us, even on this side of the House, at least, I can speak for myself, appreciate your rhetoric, I appreciate your play of words in the Hindi language. It is incomparable, but don't use that power which God has given you to totally distort the Indo-US joint communique! Half the time I didn't know what you were talking about. I was trying my best to take the notes, but I just didn't know where to stop and what to do because it didn't conform with all the reading I had done and all the preparations I had tried to, because I didn't know whether we were going to speak at the same wavelength. Let me just tell you that you laughed and ridiculed the Convention on Terrorism. You said that the UN is being mistaken for the US. We have been trying for a very long time to impress upon the western world that India has suffered at the hands of terrorists and combating terrorism is as important to us as 9/11 was to the United States of America. It is with pride and some satisfaction as a political activist that, today, we have got one of the big powers of the western world to agree and to make a joint priority commitment that to combat terrorism will be a global endeavour without any selectivity or segmentation. This is what we have to appreciate. I am not going to take much time. My other colleagues have their own points of view to make. I would only like to conclude by saying that in the field of agriculture, in the field of science and technology for growth, in the field for economic cooperation, in the field for nuclear energy import by India after such a long time, we are laying the foundation of an India, which, no doubt, you and me, we all would like to see, an India which we would leave for the next generation as a much better place that we were able to make it for ourselves. It is not the foundation which is going to doom us, it is a foundation for close cooperation internationally, with India as a global player which we have to look forward to. We have been all nurtured in a struggle for freedom which was long and arduous, and right across the country, young people gave up their lives. They saw a dream. It was also a dream which was seen by Rajiv Gandhi when he wanted to see India proud, developed and an international player. It is that dream of the freedom fighters, it is that dream of those who gave up their lives for a better India that Dr. Manmohan Singh has chosen to put it into reality.

Let us wish him well; have the broadness of spirit. Foreign Policy debates have always been a part of national consensus. It is very

unfortunate that today you reduced it to partisan polemics. I am sure, the other speakers from your side would raise again to the heights which we have been used to in the past. Thank you very much.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we are discussing a very, very important statement because this brings in many elements which pertain not only to the nuclear policy of the country but also to our general foreign policy, to our defence policy and, more particularly, to issues which relate us to the outside world.

Now, I cannot share the surprise of Ambikaji at the manner in which Sushmaji has initiated the discussion. Because I have been, as a student of politics, following for the last couple of months what has been internally happening within the BJP, a party which itself finds difficulty in defending the position of its own President and have to accept diktat from extraneous organisations, of course, "socio-cultural", and the kind of politics that particular " socio-cultural" entity is known for in the history of this country, I think, can only produce the kind of statements and rhetoric that we have seen and we have been witness to in this House. Therefore, I was not at all surprised. But, I think, at the outset, it is incumbent on me to decisively demarcate the Left Forces in this country, particluarly, the Communist party of India (Marxists) in the attempt that she made of co-opting us in the opposition of the Government. I will come to our clear-cut views on this. But we are not for nuclear-stockpilling and the kind of jingoism that we have witnessed in the House today. I will come definitely to the reservations we have on some of the issues that are obtained in the statement of the hon. Prime Minister. But, Sir, through you, I would like to reassure the entire House, that we thoroughly distance ourselves from the kind of criticism that has been made against the statement and the sequence of developments, which led to the issuing of the kind of statement that the hon. Prime Minister has made. And I think the BJP is the last party to raise all these questions. I was really surprised at the level of misinformation. For instance, reference was made about a Cabinet meeting. I would like to know, when Pokhran-II happened, how many Cabinet meetings took place? How meetings of the Cabinet Committee on Security took place? On the contrary, there was a commitment in the BJP election manifesto that they would undertake a strategic review before they use the nuclear option.

There have been references to a national consensus. If anybody has broken national consensus on strategic nuclear issues in this country, it is the BJP. Never before did we have to face the predicament of the national

consensus being broken. And I was amazed at this whole logic of 'lathi' *versus* 'lathi', gun *versus* revolver. It reminds me of a term used in the nuclear strategic discourse, 'mutually assured destruction'. The acronym was used more in the days of cold War, which stands for 'madness'. It is sheer madness to think that the stock-piling, or nuclear weaponisation, of a particular country, has to be matched by equally lethal stock-piling of nuclear arms. So, I think that was a self-destructive course and a self-destructive argument that was being prusued. But what is our objection to this?

First of all, when I read the statement very carefully, I find that the compelling argument given by the hon. Prime Minister for entering into this nuclear deal is the search for an alternative source of energy. Now, I would like to know this from the hon. Prime Minister — did we have a national debate in the country on what should be the appropriate energy-mix in this country? Since when was there a sudden recognition of nuclear energy as a major source of alternative energy? Has there been any financial accounting, and is nuclear energy the most viable form of energy? I ask this because there are several new technologies developed today in the world with regard to alternative sources of energy. One of the major new technologies is the coal gas; another major source of energy is the hydel power.

There may be those who have read the whole question of energy sciences with a little avidity. In our training for engineering, we had some courses. I feel ashamed to say that the major impediment is the principal cost involved in developing nuclear energy. Therefore, I think, it would have been better had the nation been witness to a proper, structured, discussion and debate on what should be the apropriate energy mix. If the need for nuclear energy is such an important issue, which has led to this argument, I think, to that extent, there is a certain level of lack of transparency in this exercise. But, I think we support the Government of Dr. Manmohan Singh. We support this Government because we want to differentiate fundamentally from the manner in which this Government would approach the whole question of international agreements, bilateral agreements from the earlier NDA regime. Shrimati Ambika Soni was referring to the book. Now, all of us know what kind of secret parleys were happening. So, I understand there are certain classified aspects involved in such an agreement, but, at the same time, there are several aspects of elements in this agreement which can be declassified and which could have been discussed before reaching this agreement. In that sense, the spirit of the

National Common Minimum Programme that we will try to be as transparent as possible in our governance could have been maintained. I think, the kind of confusion that had been created in certain sections of public mind could have been avoided.

The other question, which is also equally important to us, is that the independence of the nuclear programme of India is because of the force of circumstances. We know that there is a discriminatory nuclear regime in the world today. And, our approach has always been, and I was just reading from the proceedings of the House after Pokhran II, that I think, through you, Sir, hon. Prime Minister and I shared the same views in terms of bringing out the infirmities in the manner in which the NDA Government went ahead in doing what it did. And, I remember clearly how after two days, a letter was sent to President Clinton, as if as an after-thought to try and say, "Well, we did this, but that should not bother you because we are taking care of Pakistan and China." I have never seen a Government devise its nuclear strategy with a country-specific in perspective. Now, our approach on that day, in this debate, in this great House, was the question of India's position *vis-a-vis* the whole question of global disarmament. We want a nuclear-free world because of the same question of 'mad'; because nuclear war, nuclear weaponanisation, ultimately, can only lead us to a mutually-assured destruction. And, therefore, I would have been, or we would have been, happier if in your agreement, you could relate the attempt to come out of the nuclear isolation, you could have combined that with our principal stand on having a nuclear weapon-free world as the vision of Rajiv Gandhi in his Vision Document 2020, vision document on a nuclear-free world was there. I find a mention of that in your statement here, but in the agreement, when I tried to find out that inter-connection, it is not as explicit as you may have later on explicitly made in your statement. But, in the body of the agreement, as such, I think, that inter-connection is absent. Therefore, our criticism of the nuclear deal is that it does not specifically mention the aim of India, as a nation, for a global nuclear-free regime which will bring an end to all this nuclear discrimination and division of the world into nuclear haves and have-nots.

The other point about nuclear agreement, where we have our doubts, is that while we have tried to access nuclear fuel, it should not bind us to programmes which will not allow our eventual liberation from the dependence on nuclear fuel. Thorium is a nuclear fuel, which is abundantly available in the country. So, the absolute prerequisite of the independent programme of our fast breeder reactor has to be maintained and I think, it will be

important for the Government to explain to us that how they are going to calibrate its responses in terms of dealing with the safeguards because one point about the IAEA has to be mentioned that over the years, it has been used as a handmaiden of certain international powers, I mean, to the detriment of certain developing countries. We have seen that time and again, *vis-a-vis* Iraq we have seen that, *vis-a-vis* Iran we have seen that, *vis-a-vis* North Korea we have seen that. So, how are we going to tackle this whole question has to be clearly addressed.

Sir, another issue where we have serious problem with this statement is the question of terrorism and democracy. Sir, I was trying to look up at the debate following the 9/11 attack, and, I remember very sonorous words of Jaswant Singhji, our most revered Leader of the Opposition, ringing in my ears that a concert of democracy has started, a global war on terrorism has started and where we are proud partners. But, now, after Iraq has happened, second year into Iraq invasion, that concert is not producing symphony, that is only producing cacophony. We have 25 thousand civilians killed in Iraq over the last couple of years.

With the kind of democracy that we have, I totally share — I have also read half the book written by Prof. Amartya Sen — that the American foreign policy today, if it becomes a partner to us in strengthening democratic institutions, it will be difficult for us to digest that.

Sir, we cannot mince words on this. I mean we are proud of the statement that you made in terms of saying Americans that you made a mistake in Iraq, but in the same breath, you said, well that is past. Well, I have the Parliamentary unanimous Resolution passed by us. Our Resolution, all-Party Resolution, unanimous Resolution says very clearly that the occupying forces must leave. It is clearly mentioned here in the statement. Due to paucity of time, I don't want to go into that. How can that be 'past'? Does any Member of this House think as to what happened in Iraq and what the Americans have inflicted is a thing of the 'past'? I sincerely ask this question. Now, if that is not so, how can he go on fighting terrorism with Americans?

Ambikaji was saying, they have to share with us. What are they sharing? What has happened since 9/11? Has terrorism gone down? Can our approach and American approach be one and the same? What is common in that? I am sorry to say any reference to democracy; any reference to sharing fight against democracy is a travesty of the truth as it is because of the Americans largely today that terrorism is sprawling in

different parts of the world. Where was terrorism in London, where was terrorism in Madrid and where was terrorism in different parts of the world before the invasion in Iraq? I do agree with the hon. Prime Minister, with the hon. Leader of the Opposition and with hon. Shri Vajpayeeji that terrorism under no context, under no grounds can it be really defended. We don't say that. But, at the same time, unless we understand that those who are falling victims to terrorists and to ideological machinations which lead to terrorism, unless that can be effectively fought, terrorism can never be wiped out from the face of this world. Unless we politically recognise that fighting terrorism the American way is not to fight terrorism, to thwart terrorism. Therefore, Sir, we are thoroughly disappointed with that formulation on terrorism and democracy. Today, what is happening in Iraq? If something happens in London, if something happens in Madrid, people talk about it. But people do not talk about as to what is happening in Iraq. What has happened to the innocent civiliansin Iraq and London, who faced the kind of barbarism in the prisons in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Gharib prison, how can that be passed unless it continues to be a living memory and a living nightmare against which the world has to be united. I think we are not doing our cause any good, because ultimately, our objective is not a uni-polar world; our objective is to actively promote multilateralism. It is on the basis of that plan that we want the reform of the UN system, that we want expansion of the Security Council. If we believe that our permanent seat in the UN Security Council will be courtesy United States, all of us will be making a mistake. Our claim to UN Security Council is for our active promotion for the cause of multilateralism. I think that has to be underscored in this debate. I do agree that the Government has done right thing by saying that this agreement is reciprocal, by saying that it is conditional. Therefore, I think, that much of the euphoria in the country over this agreement is also premature. We have to wait and watch and see how that part of the deal is being redeemed. Because, when Tarapore came up, the Americans had a very water-tight agreement that they will continue to give us nuclear fuel. After 1974, that agreement was broken unilaterally. We have seen in several other international treaties how the Americans walked out of international agreement. Therefore, I think, much of the euphoria over this deal also may prove to be premature. If this happens, if we get the access to nuclear fuel-to continue our nuclear programme, it is fine. But, at the same time, we have to understand that in the kind of cut-throat world we live in, nobody is going to hand us over the technology on a platter, especially the frontier areas of technology. Therefore, if we want to draw any advantage out of whatever we are trying to do, we

have to be more vigorous in extending, in taking forward our independent nuclear programme. I think, that is very, very important. Sir, the footnote, with which I will end, I suppose what we discussed that there will be a separate discussion on the statement by the hon. Defence Minister on the Framework Cooperation Agreement. I think, that is also necessary. That also has cast a major cloud of doubt in the minds of the people over this present agreement. So, we have to have a full-fledged discussion on it. Finally, I think we have to understand that we live in a World, where information technology, where flow of information, has made our living space much closer. Therefore, it is not a question of what we think of certain relationship, how that relationship is perceived by the whole world. Now, the American think-tanks, day in, day out are going to say that their major objective today, their strategic mission today, is to contain China. It is to contain China and to establish the kind of hegemony that they want to establish. To that extent, we are seeing that the hopes raised during the days of cold war that when the cold war would be over, peace dividend would reach the people. It has not happened, Sir. It has not happened because of this hegemonistic, uni-polar drive for dominance that is dictating the American foreign policy. Therefore, I think, there cannot be any strategic commonality between what India thinks and what the USA thinks. We want a very good relationship with the USA. We want a very good and equal relationship as a sovereign country with the United States. But that should not be seen as contravening our equal wish to have friendly relations with other countries.

That will isolate us in the comity of nations. With this, I, once again, thank you for having made the statement so that all concerned issues could be transparently debated in this great House, which is the soul of India. The argumentative India will come out at its best in this debate. That is what I wish.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for launch at twenty-five minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at thirty minutes past two of the clock,

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Janeshwar Mishraji.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Jharkhand): Sir, the Treasury Benches are absolutely empty...(*Interruptions*)... There is no Minister...(*Interruptions*)...There is no Minister in this House, not even a Minister of State...(*Interruptions*)...Sir, the whole House cannot be kept waiting for them...(*Interruptions*)...I suggest you to adjourn the House for ten minutes. Let the Ministers come. They would have finished their lunch in the meanwhile.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned for ten minutes.

The House then adjourned at thirty one minutes past two of the clock.

The House re-assembled at
forty-one minutes past two of the clock,
[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair].

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNALAFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Sir, may I apologise to you and to the House for not being present here?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was adjourned because the House can't run without Ministers.

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): सम्मानित उपसभापति महोदय, हमें खेद है कि अपराह्न जब यह चर्चा आरंभ होने जा रही थी तो मंत्रियों के न रहने की वजह से सदन स्थगित करना पड़ा। हमें न केवल इसका खेद है, बल्कि इसको हमने बहुत गंभीरता से लिया है और हम आगे इस बात का ध्यान रखेंगे।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, मैं अपनी बात शुरू करूं, इससे पहले मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को इस बात के लिए मुबारकबाद दूंगा कि इतना बढ़िया ड्राफ्टेड वक्तव्य बहुत कम देखने को मिलता है। वैसे इस यात्रा को लेकर मेरे मन में कई कड़वाहटें हैं। व्यक्तिगत रूप से भारत के प्रधानमंत्री, श्री मनमोहन सिंह जी का मैं बहुत सम्मान करता हूं लेकिन मेरे मन में जो कड़वाहट है, उसकी तरफ इशारा करना चाहता हूं। यह सही है कि अमरीका के लोगों ने प्रधानमंत्री जी का बहुत स्वागत किया, लाल क़ालीन बिछाकर स्वागत किया, बासमती चावल और आम की चटनी खिलाकर स्वागत किया। हालांकि अमरीका के लोग बासमती को अपने यहां पेटेंट कर रहे हैं, लेकिन हमारे यहां का बासमती खिलाकर वे हमको थोड़ा ललचाने की कोशिश करते रहे। शायद वहां धारणा यह है कि हम गरीब लोग हैं, बाजा-वाजा बजाकर हमको खुश कर लिया जाएगा। हिंदुस्तान में जो प्रचार के माध्यम हैं, इन्होंने इसको बहुत तूल दिया, लेकिन यह सच है कि अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति जब किसी राष्ट्र के प्रधान के सम्मान में भोज आयोजित करते हैं या मीटिंग करते हैं, तो

उनके जो बहुत नजदीकी लोग होते हैं, उनकी मीटिंग टैक्सास में हुआ करती है, जहां उनका बहुत बड़ा गार्डन है, अंगूर का बगीचा है। वहां उन्होंने ब्लेयर साहब, फ्रांस के लोग और यहां तक कि मुशर्रफ साहब को भी बुलाया था। मैं ऐसे परिवार में पैदा हुआ हूं कि भेदभाव देखकर भड़क जाता हूं, इसलिए जब भोज में भेदभाव होता है, तो मेरे मन में टीस उठी कि हम खाना खाने के लिए जाएं, तो हमको ऐसी जगह बिठला दिया जाए और हमारे बगल के मुशर्रफ जैसे लोग जाएं तो बढ़िया जगह बिठला दिया जाए, इसके लिए थोड़ी टीस उठी थी। मैं चाहूंगा कि मेरी इस टीस को यह सदन और राष्ट्र जरूर नोट करे। लेकिन फिर भी आवभगत ठीक थी। हम लोग दुनिया में डिप्लोमेसी के मामले में अलग-थलग से होते जा रहे हैं। अब हम अलग-थलग क्यों हो रहे हैं, इस वक्तव्य के सिलसिले में उस पर आज बहस नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन अब लगा कि हम भी कहीं मैदान में है, हमारी भी हाजिरी रजिस्टर पर है और इसके लिए मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को बधाई दूंगा। न्यूक्लियर और एटामिक एनर्जी को लेकर बातचीत शुरू हुई तो मुझे थोड़ा-सा झटका फिर लगा था, क्योंकि हम गांधी के देश के आदमी हैं और आइंस्टाइन के देश में गए थे। हमें कभी-कभी लग रहा था कि गांधी आइंस्टाइन से एटम मांगने गया है या एटम के बारे में कोई हुनर मांगने गया है। मैं बिल्कुल घबरा गया। यह समझ कर चलिएगा प्रधानमंत्री जी और सरकार चलाने वाले लोगों या कभी इधर के लोग चलाएं तो भी, लोग एक्सप्लोज़न के दम पर बड़ी-बड़ी बातें किया करते हैं, कभी भी मानव समाज की किसी भी समस्या का हल हथियार और ताकत से नहीं निकाला जा सकता। जो लोग बोलते हैं कि ताकत रहती है, तभी कोई बात करता है, कभी भी ताकत से हल नहीं निकला करता। यह जितनी एटामिक पॉवर है, जितनी एटामिक एनर्जी है या जितने बम बने हैं, शायद ये कूड़े की तरह से सजे रह जाएंगे। इनका कभी इस्तेमाल ही नहीं होगा।

मैं मानता हूं कि इस समय मनुष्य का वह तेज तर्रार दिमाग एक निरर्थक मशक्कत कर रहा है, जो रक्षा के नाम पर इस तरह का हथियार जुटाता जा रहा है, लेकिन वह जुटाता जा रहा है, जो कि बहुत बुरा है। दो ही रास्ते हैं - या तो आइंस्टाइन का दिया हुआ बम या गांधी की दी हुई अहिंसा। कौन-सी ज्यादा दिनों तक जिन्दा रहेगी मनुष्य समाज को चलाने के लिए, संचालित करने के लिए? जब अम्बिका जी कांग्रेस की थाती बता रही थीं, तो बड़े-बड़े लोगों का नाम ले रही थीं। उन्होंने जो पहले 2-3 नाम लिए, उनमें गांधी जी का नाम नहीं लिया। मुझे बड़ा झटका लगा था। लेकिन दूसरे वाले नाम में उन्होंने गांधी जी का नाम लिया। गांधी एक व्यक्ति नहीं थे और वे कांग्रेस की धरोहर नहीं हैं, कांग्रेस की कमाई नहीं है, वे सम्पूर्ण मानव समाज की कमाई थे। उनको अपना बना कर, केवल कांग्रेस पार्टी का बोल कर आप हम लोगों के साथ अन्याय करेंगे या देश के बाकी लोगों के साथ अन्याय करेंगे।

उस पर जब चर्चाएं हुई तो सुषमा जी ने ये शंकाएं जाहिर की हैं। यह सही है कि 8 घंटे, 10 घंटे या 12 घंटे हिन्दुस्तान के न्यूक्लियर वैज्ञानिकों से सलाह लेने के लिए उस मसविदे पर हस्ताक्षर करने में प्रधानमंत्री जी को विलम्ब हुआ था। लेकिन यह भी सही है कि जिस तरह के वैज्ञानिकों से आपने सलाह लिया था, उनके समकक्ष या उनसे कुछ और ऊपर के वैज्ञानिकों ने इसे राष्ट्रहित के

खिलाफ कहा है। यह अखबार में छपा है। हमने यह क्लब की मैम्बरी और बिना वोट की मैम्बरी को लेकर इतनी ज्यादा अपनी बड़ाई हांक दी कि हमें तो कभी-कभी हंसी आती थी, क्योंकि हमारे अखबार तो छाप रहे थे कि बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि हो गई, लेकिन अमेरिका के न्यूयार्क टाइम्स ने छापा था कि अमेरिका ने इन दो सवालों पर, हथियार और सिक्युरिटी काउंसिल, इंडिया को रिबफ कर दिया। मेरा ख्याल है कि वह हेडिंग भी सरकार के विद्वान अधिकारियों के सामने से गुजरा होगा। उसके मायने मैं अभी नहीं समझ पर रहा हूं, लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा कि इसकी सफाई होनी चाहिए कि क्या हम वहां रिबफ हुए हैं?

सुषमा जी ने कई, बातें, जो बातचीत के दौरान हुई हैं, उनकी तरफ इशारा किया था और कहा था कि वे तो टालमटोल कर गए, हमें वह ताकत दी भी नहीं। यह सही है कि प्रधानमंत्री जी एक डिप्लोमैट की तरह बोल गए। दूसरे देशों से जब रिश्ते बनते हैं, तो शायद डिप्लोमेसी उसका तकाजा बन जाया करती है। प्रधानमंत्री जी ने एक डिप्लोमैट की तरह कह दिया कि अमेरिका ने जो कुछ भी इराक में किया, वह गलत था, वह उसकी भूल थी। यह सही है कि उस धरती पर जाकर इतनी बड़ी बात बोल देना भारत जैसे गरीब देश के लिए यह गौरव की बात है। इन्होंने सीना तान कर बोल दिया, मैं उसकी तारीफ करता हूं लेकिन यह डिप्लोमेसी कितने दिनों चलेगी?

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे याद है कि इस सदन में उस समय एक लम्बी बहस चली थी, सरकार की तरफ से एक प्रस्ताव आया था। सरकार उस घटना को डिप्लोर कर रही थी और हम लोग विपक्ष में रह कर कंडेम कर रहे थे। तीन दिनों तक इस में जिच बनी रह गयी, चौथे दिन यहीं सभापति जी के कमरे में तय हुआ कि हिंदी में निंदा रहेगा और अंग्रेजी में deplore रहेगा। हम अपनी तरफ से कोई डिप्लोमेसी खेल रहे थे, जैसे अमेरिका में हिंदी जानने वाले नहीं हैं और वे उस का तर्जुमा नहीं कर सकते। तो यह डिप्लोमेसी कहलाती है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी डिप्लोमेसी कर दी और क्या वह भूल थी? सच पूछिए ईराक में जो कुछ भी हुआ, वह भूल थी, वह हुआ करती है कि आदमी अपनी करनी से अपने को नुकसान पहुंचा दे। जैसे मैं पान पराग खाता हूं। मैं जानता हूं कि यह मेरी भूल है, मेरा नुकसान हो रहा है, मैं अपना नुकसान कर रहा हूं, लेकिन किसी के कृत्य से दूसरे का नुकसान हो जाए, वह भूल नहीं कहलाती, वह अपराध की संज्ञा में आता है। मैं पान पराग खाकर किसी की कमीज पर थूक दूं, यह अपराध बन गया। उसे खुद अपने भीतर पी जाऊं तो यह भूल कहलाएगी। हम समझते हैं कि इतनी बारीक बात, ऐसी शब्दावली, देश की अबोध जनता या दुनिया की अबोध जनता समझ नहीं पाएगी, लेकिन डिप्लोमेसी कहती है कि उस को भूल ही कहा जाए तो मैं भी उस स्वागत करता हूं। लेकिन वहां जो कुछ भी हुआ, हम लोगों ने इस सदन में जो कुछ किया, उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी इस तरफ बैठा करती थी और अटल जी की सरकार थी, तब हिंदी में निंदा और अंग्रेजी में deplore किया गया। वह डिप्लोमेसी कह रही थी कि शायद अमेरिका वाले हमारा अंग्रेजी का प्रस्ताव पढ़ेंगे और हिंदी वाला नहीं पढ़ पाएंगे। हम कितने चालाक हैं, यह हम को समझना चाहिए, फिर चाहे इधर की सरकार हो या उधर की सरकार हो। इसलिए मैं कह रहा था कि

हम से थोड़ी गलतियां हो जाती हैं, हम कभी miss कर जाते हैं और बहुत बुरी तरह से miss कर जाते हैं कहीं-न कहीं हम से छूट जाता है। अभी जैसे समझौता हुआ वह कहां तक जाएगा क्योंकि अगर कोई घटना होती है तो उसकी दुनिया भर में कई प्रतिक्रियाएं होती हैं। हमारी सरहद से बाहर और देश भी हैं, हमारे पड़ोस में भी हैं। अब कौन-कौन-सी घटनाएं होंगी अभी इस का अंदाजा नहीं लगाया जा सकता, लेकिन कुछ-न-कुछ घटनाएं होंगी। उपसभापति जी, एक घटना तो अभी हो गयी। हम ने अखबार में पढ़ा है कि बांग्लादेश के बजट में कोई प्रावधान नहीं था, चीन की सरकार ने 12 लड़ाकू जहाज बांग्लादेश को देने का फैसला कर लिया है। तो हमारे पड़ोस में बांग्लादेश भी है, चीन भी है। आप एक तरह कुछ करते रहेंगे, दूसरी सरहद पर कुछ-न-कुछ फूटता रहेगा। तो जब कभी भी कुछ करने लगें तो हम को अपनी सरहद और अपने अंदरूनी मामलों की चौकसी बरतनी पड़ेगी। अगर वह चौकसी हम बरतने को तैयार नहीं हैं तो शायद हम अपने मुल्क का कल्याण नहीं कर पाएंगे। फिर मुल्क की सरकारें 6 महीने, 2 साल या 5 साल रहती है, लेकिन मुल्क तो शाश्वत रहेगा और जब शाश्वत रहेगा तो उसकी अपनी एक दृष्टि रहा करती है। उपसभापति महोदय, हम ने शुरू में कहा कि लगता है गांधी, आइंस्टाइन के यहां एटम की पढ़ायी पढ़ने गए हैं, ऐसा लग रहा था क्योंकि मनमोहन सिंह सादगी के प्रतीक हैं और हमारे प्रधानमंत्री हैं। यह कहने की क्या जरूरत थी कि हमें सेक्युरिटी काउंसिल में रखो। हम जानते हैं कि हमारी ताकत क्या है। जो 4 बिग "बी" जिन्हें जी-4 कहते हैं, उन में जिन लोगों के लिए वोट पड़ा या दस्तखत हुए हैं, उस में भारत भी एक है, लेकिन 23 देशों के लोगों ने दस्तखत किए हैं और वहां 150 के ऊपर देश हैं। महोदय, हम लोग विदेशों का दौरा करते हैं, माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी वहां के विदेश मंत्रियों से या प्रधान मंत्रियों से टेस्ट लड़ाया करते हैं और वहां की जनता और अपनी जनता की बहबूदी के लिए "विश" किया करते हैं, लेकिन केवल 23 लोगों ने दस्तखत किए। हम जिससे बात करने जा रहे हैं कि हम को सेक्युरिटी काउंसिल का मेंबर बनाओ, उसे मालूम नहीं है कि हमारे समर्थन में केवल 23 लोग हैं। यहां तक कि रूस भी नहीं चाहता कि हम उस में जाएं।

हम कहते हैं कि हमको वीटो पावर दिया जाए। हमारा जो शाश्वत दोस्त है, वह भी यह नहीं चाहता। हमने वक्तव्य में पढ़ा कि हमने अमेरिका के साथ जो कुछ भी बात की वह बराबरी के पैमाने पर की है। हमने झुककर बात नहीं की और उन्होंने भी झुककर बात नहीं की। क्या हम में कभी यह कहने की हिम्मत नहीं है कि जब हम दुनिया की पंचायत में बैठें, तो बराबरी के पैमाने पर बैठें। किसी भी देश को वीटो का अधिकार नहीं होना चाहिए, बल्कि बहुमत जो फैसला करे, वह फैसला चलना चाहिए। यह वीटो का अधिकार किस बात के लिए है? इसे खत्म करना जरूरी है, वरना थोड़े-से राष्ट्र दादागिरी करते रहेंगे और हम उसी दादागिरी में एक दादा बनने के लिए आतुर-से होते जा रहे हैं, जो कि उपसभापति महोदय, मैं पसंद नहीं करता और न ही मेरी पार्टी पसंद करती है। सबको बराबर की ताकत होनी चाहिए, तभी वह विश्व पंचायत या संयुक्त राष्ट्र एक सशक्त संस्था बन सकती है, वरना थोड़े-से लोग जब चाहें, जिस सवाल को, जिधर से चाहें मोड़ दें, बंद कर दें, खुलने न दें। यह ताकत उनको मिल जाए। उनकी अपनी पसन्द-नापसंद हुआ

करती है, उनके प्रिजुडिसेज हुआ करते हैं, उनके व्यापार के रिश्ते हुआ करते हैं और उस हिसाब से वे अपना पैमाना बनाते रहें। अगर किसी भी देश को वीटो पावर रहता है, तब तक दुनिया में शांति कायम हो नहीं सकती। पता नहीं, वर्तमान सरकार में यह कहने की ताकत है या नहीं, यह मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन विदेश मंत्री जी से और प्रधान मंत्री जी से मैं चाहूंगा कि यह लालच छोड़ दें कि हम भी वीटो पावर बनें। हमको संदेश देना चाहिए। गांधी जी दुनिया को अहिंसा का संदेश दे रहे थे। कांग्रेस पार्टी ही नहीं, पूरा हिन्दुस्तान उनकी विरासत है। यह संदेश क्यों नहीं देते हैं कि कोई बड़ा और छोटा नहीं रहेगा? जिस दिन यह संदेश हमारे यहां से निकल जाएगा, हम समझते हैं कि मानव संबंधों को, राष्ट्र के धरातल पर, जो घेराबंदी करके हम लोग एक-एक राष्ट्र बनाए हैं, हम समझते हैं कि सम्पूर्ण मानव समाज को एक करने में हमें सहूलियत हो जाएगी या आने वाली पीढ़ी को हो जाएगी। इसलिए जरूरी है कि हमको उस पर मजबूती से कोई-न-कोई रुख अख्तियार करना पड़ेगा।

हम तो सोच रहे थे कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी गए हैं। हमारे देश में भूख है, भुखमरी है। अमेरिका एक सम्पन्न देश है, खाता-पीता देश है। दुनिया का सबसे खाता-पीता देश महाप्रभु कहलाता है। हमको बात करनी चाहिए थी कि दुनिया में जहां कहीं भी भूख हो, जहां कहीं भी भुखमरी हो, इन सबको खत्म करने के लिए हम तुमसे बहस करने आए हैं। हालांकि हम तो विकासशील हैं, लेकिन दुनिया जिस रफ्तार से भूख से लड़ रही है, उससे हमको कभी-कभी लगता है कि जिस किसी दिन दुनिया से भूख और भुखमरी खत्म हो जाएगी तो थोड़े दिनों के बाद दुनिया के बच्चे हिन्दुस्तान देखने आएंगे, कालाहांडी देखने आएंगे कि उनके पुरखे यहां किस तरह भूख से मरा करते थे। हम भुखमरी के मामले में और भूख के मामले में दुनिया की नुमाईश बन जाएंगे और शायद पूरे-का-पूरा एशिया और अफ्रीका ऐसा बन जाएगा। इसलिए जरूरी था कि भारत उनकी तरफ से नेतृत्व करता हुआ अमेरिका से बहस करता और अमेरिका के मार्फत पूरी गोरी दुनिया से बहस करता कि आज दुनिया में जो भूख और भुखमरी व्याप्त है, इसको दूर करने के लिए कोई प्रयास करो। हमको याद है, हमने पढ़ा भी है कि गांधी जी लंदन गए थे और कुछ अमेरिकी लड़कों ने आकर उनसे पूछ लिया कि बापू, जरा अमेरिका चलो। तो गांधी जी ने कहा कि अभी अमेरिका हमारे जाने लायक नहीं बना है। जिस दिन मेरी बात समझने लायक बन जाएगा, उस दिन मैं आऊंगा। हिन्दुस्तान का एक मामूली-सा लंगोटी पहनने वाला आदमी अमेरिका के पूरे अस्तित्व को उन दिनों चुनौती देता था, जब आजादी की लड़ाई चलती थी। आज भूख के सवाल पर सम्पन्न दुनिया के जो खाते-पीते लोग हैं, वे अपने बल पर खाते-पीते नहीं हैं, बल्कि हम ही से लूटे हुए माल को खाते-पीते हैं। पूरा यूरोप उसमें आएगा। हमें यह बहस छेड़नी पड़ेगी कि दुनिया में कोई भूख से न मरे। इसके लिए हमको गंभीरता से सोचना होगा। ...(समय की घंटी)... उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आखिरी बात खत्म कर दूं। मैं तो बहुत बोलना भी नहीं चाहता। आखिरी बात, आतंकवाद वाली है। मैं गैस पाईप लाईन वाला भी बोलना चाहता था, लेकिन आपने घंटी बजा दी तो अब मैं उसे छोड़ दे रहा हूं। लेकिन मैं आतंकवाद वाली बात बोलना चाहता हूं। आतंकवाद वाली बात, इसलिए कि

3.00 P.M.

अभी दो-तीन महीनों में अयोध्या से लेकर जौनपुर और कश्मीर से लेकर के हमारी पलटन के इंजीनियरिंग ऑफिस के गेट तक जो वारदातें हुई हैं, वे क्या संदेश देती हैं? कहीं हमारी कमजोरी है। कहने को तो हम अपनी पीठ थपथपा लें, मगर जिस मुल्क की पलटन अपने कैंटोनमेंट की हिफाजत नहीं कर सकती है, उस मुल्क की पलटन क्या सरहद की हिफाजत कर सकती है? आज मुल्क के सामने यह बहुत बड़ा सवाल है। आतंकवादी अगर पलटन के ऑफिस के गेट पर आकर बम फोड़ कर भाग जाएं, तो हमारे इंतजाम में कहीं न कहीं खोट है। हमने कस के नहीं रखा। यह एक चुनौती है।

उपसभापति जी, हमको याद है, पार्लियामेंट पर कुछ आतंकवादी आ गए थे। इधर के लोग उधर बैठे थे, इस सदन में हम लोग भी थे। उस समय के प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कहा था कि आर-पार की लड़ाई लड़ूंगा। हम बड़े चक्कर में थे कि आर-पार की लड़ाई क्या होती है? एक घटना हुई है, आतंकवादी मार दिए गए हैं और बहुत प्रोटेस्ट हो गया है और यह आर-पार की बात। मैं थोड़ी देर के लिए घबराया। सुषमा जी दक्षिण भारत के एक कवि की लाईन सुना रही थीं कि निडर बनो, निडर बनो, निडर बनो। कौन कवि थे?

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सुब्रह्मण्यम भारती जी।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: जी, सुब्रह्मण्यम भारती जी। उनकी यह लाइन सुनाई कि हम घबराए नहीं। जब आतंकवादी आए, सेंट्रल हाल में हम उस पर बहस कर रहे थे, तो निडर बनो, निडर बनो, निडर बनो की लाइन आपने सुनाई। हमको याद आ गया, जब मैं बहुत छोटा बच्चा था और जब बहुत अंधेरा हो जाता था, दादी मुझे गोद में लेकर किसी बगिया में चलती थी, अंधेरा देखकर मुझे डर लगने लगता था, तो उस समय दादी बोलती थी कि बजरंग बली का पाठ करो, हनुमान-चालीसा का पाठ करो। हमें हिम्मत दिलाने के लिए सुब्रह्मण्यम भारती की लाइन और बजरंग बली पाठ, हनुमान-चालीसा।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: आपको हिम्मत दिला रही थी, निडर बनो जो कह रही थी।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: तो हम लोगों को हिम्मत दिलाने के लिए, तसल्ली दिलाने के लिए, यह हुआ करता है। उस समय जो आर-पार की बात चली थी, तो पूरा सदन, पूरा राष्ट्र खड़ा होकर एक स्वर में बोला था कि हम आपके साथ हैं। यह सब लोगों ने कहा था कि आप जो चाहो, करो, छूट दी जा रही है, लेकिन आर-पार कुछ नहीं हो सका। क्योंकि दूसरी परिस्थितियां, बाहर की परिस्थितियां दबाव बनाती रहती हैं। विदेश की जो कोई नीति बनेंगी, जब कभी भी आर-पार की बात करेंगे, तो वे दूसरी ताकतें दबाव बनाएंगी। अमरीका तो अपने आप में सबसे बड़ी ताकत है। वह कौन-कौन सा दबाव बनाएगा, कौन-कौन सी हरकत करेगा, कह नहीं सकते। हो सकता है, जैसा अभी नीलोत्पल बसु जी कह रहे थे कि हो सकता है कि चीन के खिलाफ हमको खड़ा कर दे, हो सकता है कि किसी के खिलाफ लड़ाने लगे, क्योंकि वह इस्तेमाल करता है। सबसे पहले इस सदन में इस

सरकार को और सदन को मिलकर यह तय करना है कि हम गरीब रहें, हम कमजोर रहें, लेकिन किसी के हाथ इस्तेमाल नहीं होंगे, हम प्रयोग की वस्तु नहीं बनेंगे। यह आश्वासन प्रधानमंत्री जी को सदन में देना पड़ेगा और इस सदन में यह कहना पड़ेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान चाहे मुफलिसी में रहता हो, वह किसी में प्रयोग की वस्तु नहीं बनेगा। क्योंकि हमको डर लग रहा है, जब हम बड़े घराने में जाते हैं, तब हमारा इस्तेमाल हुआ करता है और वह डर अभी बरकरार है। इस डर को निर्मूल करना वर्तमान सरकार का और विशेष रूप से प्रधानमंत्री जी का कर्त्तव्य बनता है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि इसको आप जरूर निर्मूल करें।

उपसभापति जी, बाकी बातें मैं अभी छोड़ देता हूं फिर कभी बात होगी, अभी तो प्रणब जी भी आने वाले हैं, उनके बयान पर अलग से बहस होगी, तब उस पर हम लोग फिर बात करेंगे। आपका बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am happy that the Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh had a fruitful visit to the United States, the sole superpower of the world. Sir, the relations between the United States and India have been improving since the end of the Cold War and dismantling of the Soviet Union. Sir, in the past, the United States always saw India as an appendage of the Soviet Union and, therefore, thought it unwise to have friendly relations with the world's largest democracy, India.

I am happy to note that we have achieved limited success during the Prime Minister's visit to the United States. The Prime Minister made a statement on the eve of the visit to Washington that "India is not on sale that anybody making such a charge or questioning the patriotism of the Congress Party..." I do not know what warranted the Prime Minister to make such a provocative statement against its partners in the Government.

Sir, immediately after the meeting with President Bush, the Prime Minister talked about the problems in implementing the Iran-India gas pipeline project. Inspired stories planted in the print media say that President Bush never raised the Iran pipeline issue. Sir, the whole world knows that the United States is opposed to the Iran pipeline. The Prime Minister's statement amounted to buckling under pressure. While we welcome the nuclear cooperation with the United States with all the conditionalities imposed on us, we should not close our options on securing the natural gas from Iran. Sir, gas is a cheap and clean fuel while the nuclear power has its own environmental problems. So, the Prime Minister should give an appearance that he is not buckling under pressure by the United States by openly supporting the pipeline project.

Sir, terrorism is a major issue and Taliban is a major cause for this menace. The United States and the European powers were passive spectators when India was target of global terrorism aided and abatted by Pakistan. Sir, when their own countries are affected, they try to understand our problems. The whole world knows who created Taliban and sustained it for over 20 years.

Sir, my another submission is that India also has not been successful in getting the nod from the United States for our candidature in the United Nations Security Council. Sir, the Prime Minister merely says in his statement the United States has a different position on this matter, it has not found it possible to endorse India's position. Sir, by this statement, the Prime Minister has chosen not to involve the Parliament about the United States position on India's bid for the United Nations Security Council Membership.

Sir, the Prime Minister should come out openly why the United States opposes our legitimate claim in securing the United Nations Security Council Membership.

Sir, I would not like to call the Prime Minister's United States' visit a big success. Sir, we should contine to engage the United States since it is the sole superpower of the world. At the same time, we should bargain hard since it needs India to give protection to the crude oil traffic from the Gulf countries to its allies, Korea and Japan. Sir, if we do not bargain hard, the United States will continue to take India for a ride.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati N.P. Durga. But before you speak, I would like to inform the hon. Members that there are 15 speakers. The hon. Prime Minister will be replying by about 4.30. So, I would request the hon. Member that they should stick to the time, which I will be telling them, and they have to conclude their submissions within that time. Shrimati Durga, you have five minutes.

SHRIMATI N.P. DURGA (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. Sir, I wish to seek a few specific clarifications on some of the points from the Statement made by the hon. Prime Minister. Hon. Prime Minister in para 4 of his statement said that a Science and Technology Framework Agreement has been agreed which helps us to further joint research and training with US. He also said that the US has removed five organisations from its Entity List. I wish to know still how

many Defence organisations of India are under Entity List. I wish to know whether the P.M. has got any assurance from Mr. Bush that within a fixed time-frame all the Defence and Space organisations will be removed from the Entity List.

Sir my second point is Mr. Bush said that he would seek agreement from the US Congress to adjust US laws and policies to work with friends and allies to adjust international regimes to enable civil nuclear energy cooperation and trade with India. It needs to be clarified, Sir. How the US is going to convince US Congress because we know how in spite of Mr. Clinton's backing for CTBT, US Senate rejected the proposal. I also fail to understand as to what is the necessity for India to concede a key demand of US for allowing the International Atomic Energy Agency to monitor the non-military side of our nuclear energy programme. Will it not hamper the on-going research work on Fast Breeder Reactor programme and compromise India's long-term energy security?

The next point I wish to be clarified is why India agreed to reverse our long-standing policy of not putting its civilian nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards or Missile Technology Control Regime and Nuclear Supplies Group Guidelines without any approval from Parliament because before putting civil nuclear facilities under above have to have the approval from Parliament.

'The next point is, it is surprising to know that there was not even a single reference made by our Prime Minister with Mr. Bush with regard to our becoming a permanent Member of the UN Security council. Why did India not seek US's cooperation as a part of its mustering support for our UN Seat in the recently held meeting with Mr. Bush because it was a golden opportunity to put forth our viewpoint?

I understand that US agreed to help India in our Defence cooperation. What exactly is the cooperation that India is going to get from US with regard to modernising our army and how US is going to help us in developing our Defence Missile Systems? I would like to know whether US has agreed for transfer of technology pertaining to missile Defence system.

Sir, my last point is on terrorism. We are a victim of terrorism. Even according to a report of US, India is the worst victim of terrorism in 2003. I don't know what transpired between our Prime Minister and Mr. Bush to fight terrorism. But the fact of the matter is that we are not given any role to play in combating terrorism at the international level. We have been screaming for action against terrorism but no one is listening to us. Now,

the situation is changing and the world is understanding India's point of view. So, I wish to know what significant role, with the help of USA, India can play now in shaping the long-term global political strategy to deal with terrorism looking at our political strategies which are different from the US. I want to know whether any dialogue between India and US took place on this count. With this, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. Sir, I rise to compliment the Prime Minister on his visit to the United States and also the statement which he made in this House. The Prime Minister's visit to the United States of America was a significant one. It was being watched with interest not only in India, not only in America but all over world for two reasons, because America is a pre-eminent Superpower and India is an emerging power. When Dr. Manmohan Singhji went to America, he went there in his capacity as the Prime Minister of India, a proud and vibrant India, a nation of one billion people, an India which is an emerging economy, an India which is treated and heard with respect in the comity of nations. He went and talked to the leadership of America as inheritor of a rich legacy, which has believed in freedom, which has believed in India's independence, its autonomy and also taking positions, which are just on international affairs. Sir, there was clearly an acknowledgement of the growing stature of India, given the nature of reception which the hon. Prime Minister received though there were comparisons being made. Janeshwar Mishraji, of course, I have utmost respect for him but who is invited where, I think there is some misconception; the Prime Minister undoubtedly was accorded the highest welcome which the United States could give to any visiting head or Government. Sir, there has been criticisms as well as compliments. I was listening carefully to Sushmaji. Some of the criticisms are because of lack of understanding, lack of comprehension and that does happen. In a democracy, you cannot expect everybody to agree, everybody to endorse. But some of the criticism is purely politically motivated, criticism for the sake of criticism. There are areas when we can criticise each other and debate against each other but there are areas where that tendency needs to be curbed. This, was one issue where we expected the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues to be more accepting than to be openly critical. Well, one thing, Sir, which stands out from the Prime Minister's visit is, if we consider the purpose of the visit, then there is little room for confusion. The Prime Minister went there to engage the US leadership, to apprise them about India's position and also India's ability to contribute to the global affairs. What stands out most is our quest for Energy security, which is important,

given the fact that there is shortage, given the fact that energy and power is vitally important if India has to grow at a faster pace. None other than the Prime Minister of India would have been aware of certain critical shortages, especially with regard to our stated targets of nuclear power generation. My friend, Nilotpalji did mention about the mix of energy, whether we have discussed that, but the truth is nuclear energy is going to play an important role. Therefore, the agreement on civilian nuclear energy cooperation is the most important achievement that has been reached without compromising India's position, without diluting India's stated position. Why are doubts being raised? When this is being criticised and also the reference which Sushmaji was making that they have not recognised us and you are celebrating. It is not a question of celebration. We are mature and responsible. When in the joint statement it is stated that 'India is a responsible nation with advanced nuclear technology,' there is a *de-facto* recognition, it is implicit in that statement. Shri Jaswant Singh has been Foreign Minister and he will, surely, advise you on this. You had been in the Cabinet, Sushmaji. Without signing the NPT there cannot be a formal recognition. But, there is a *de facto* recognition which is very clear when the US undertook to also speak to other Nuclear-Member States. Now, when we talk of other achievements, besides this Agreement, let us not forget that for over three and a half decades, there were sanctions against us and sanctions against our Nuclear facilities. There was a blockade which further aggravated after 1998 blasts, which, you were referring to very proudly. I will not go into that. But, whether it was Tarapore or other nuclear facilities—you were in the Government, you would know--you know how badly they need fuel. But, we have got it on equal terms. Today, if those sanctions are lifted, it is our nuclear facilities which will receive from the Nuclear Supply Group the fuel and also the technology.

There was also another issue. It is the List of Entities. There were many of our research institutions, space organisations, including ISRO, Tarapore, Rajasthan Atomic Power Station, which were in the List of Entities and to the best of my understanding they have been removed from that List. I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for this major achievement.

Sir, there was also a talk about reciprocity. Sushmaji was finding the usage very amusing and was quoting one US official, Mr. Nicolas Burn, on the issue of reciprocity. We are discussing the statement of our hon. Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister was very clear and categorical on reciprocity that we will take certain actions in a phased manner and all our actions would be reciprocal to what is done by the other side. The Joint

Statement clearly states that India's commitment is reciprocal and if the US does not fulfil its obligations, there is no pressure on India to do so either. Let us not presume, at this stage, that the USA has no intention to fulfil the obligations or the assurances. They have their own system of governance and their own system of functioning. We all know that the President of the US has to go back to the US Congress. There are certain laws in place. Those laws have to be amended. So, that basic understanding is required whether before the amendment of those regimes, especially the restrictive regimes, any President or head of the State of America could have signed otherwise. But, you are trying to give a distorted presentation by questioning both the sincerity of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister and also the ability of this Government to safeguard India's interest and India's honour. That was most unfortunate. In the Prime Minister's statement and in the Joint Statement, what stands out is the issue of separation of civil and strategic nuclear facilities. Much has been said about it. It has also been said that it will severely compromise India's independence to develop its strategic nuclear capability. This was said, today, in this House despite the Prime Minister reassuring and the statement being clear and categorical on that and saying that under no circumstances our strategic nuclear development will be slowed down.

Sir, we are proud of our scientists who, in spite of more than 30 years of sanctions, not only made India nuclear capable but they mastered the entire nuclear fuel cycle. Because of their achievements, India was heard with respect and given that status when the Prime Minister went and engaged the US President and the US leadership. Sir, as Sushmaji was questioning and quoting Dr. Prasad, one of our eminent atomic scientists, the separation will be done as per the decision of this Government. Nobody is going to give India a list that these are your military facilities and these are your civilian facilities. And what the Prime Minister had done, before signing, to the best of my understanding, our nuclear scientists and those who are engaged in senior positions in advanced nuclear research, including on fast-breeder reactors, were consulted. And, they have endorsed this. The national security considerations had been kept in mind. Therefore, there should not be any doubt. At least, I don't have. This House must not have any doubt that by this separation, and also by opening up the civilian facilities, which this Government will determine as to which will be civilian facilities to the International Atomic Energy Safeguards for inspection, we are compromising India's security. How can we get the fuel? How can we get the technology? We are not a signatory to the NPT. Unless and until, at least, we also accept the

responsibilities and obligations of a Nuclear State. How many nuclear facilities the US has? How many of them are open? They have also divided very clearly, whether the UK has done it, France has done it, Russia has done it. If you rightfully claim to be a nuclear power, why are you running away from that?

Sir, there was much talk about the national strength, national pride and about the nuclear deterrence. Before I come to pride and strength, let me remind Sushmaji that as far as the moratorium on nuclear tests is concerned, that decision was actually made by the NDA Government. Let me also quote one of our eminent nuclear scientists. Dr. Gopala Krishnan. In a recent article, where he reassures the country that the nuclear jewels are safe, he has stated that the Vajpayee Government had asserted in 1998 itself that they can moderately produce powerful fission and thermonuclear warheads without any further tests. That was the decision which was conveyed to the United States of America by the Vajpayee Government. And, today, Sushmaji was eloquent on deterrence. It surprises me when a claim is made on national pride as if that is the custodianship of the BJP. We on this side, the Congress Party and other allies, are proud Indians. We are proud of this country. We are also proud of its achievements. We are proud of its independence because we have fought for it. We have sacrificed for it. And, we need no sermons from anyone, and I repeat, from anyone about our national pride, about our independence and our ability to make independent judgements and decisions. (*Interruptions*) Sir, now, let me talk of 'pride', and how well was India's pride and self-respect kept. Sushmaji, when the Prime Minister was there, we also had our Foreign Minister there. You totally ignored that the India's External Affairs Minister, Natwar Singhji, was also there. You said, "प्रधान मंत्री और चार अधिकारियों ने बैठकर फैसला कर लिया।" बड़ी अजीब बात कही। Why you had ignored, I can tell you. Because, for the first time breaking protocol, the US Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, called on our External Affairs Minister. With all due respect to you, Jaswant Singhji, when you were the External Affairs Minister, you were running after a junior Under Secretary of State, Strobe Talbott. This is the difference, when you talk of engaging, when you talk of level of engagement, when you talk of national pride. There were references made, which I don't need to go into in detail, about Fissile Material Control Treaty, as if some compromises have been made. My understanding is correct, whatsoever will happen in future will be based on reciprocity or what India receives. As of today, India is not a signatory, but India is recognised as a major nuclear power. Here, it is

important to set the record straight. Allow me to quote from the same Strobe Talbott's book. Well, Jaswant Singhji knows better--everybody knows who Strobe Talbott is, and I am sure ...*(Interruptions)*... don't disrupt me Mr. Jairam Ramesh, he has said--, because Jaswant Singhji met him at various places, in Tokyo, in Rome, In Manila--on India signing the CTBT, Jaswant said--"that India would sign the CTBT by the end of May. If this were actually to happen, it would be a significant development..." This is important Sushmaji, because you said that Prime Minister did not consult anybody, Opposition, Parliament. You were privy to the Cabinet Committee on Security having met or not. Now, please listen to this carefully. He says, "if this were to actually happen, it would be a significant development, but it would still leave ratification of the treaty for the indefinite future. When I pointed this out, Jaswantji assured me that under the Indian system, signature was tantamount to ratification, which he called "a mere formality". Ratification of this Parliament would have been a mere formality. This is what the then Foreign Minister of India conveyed to Strobe Talbortt and he was such a good friend. He has reproduced without missing any comma, or full stop in his book. "The second adjustment...--he writes further--in the Indian position was a statement that they might join the long-sought, elusive moratorium on the production of fissile material--but only on the condition that the other six countries that had tested did likewise." I think, BJP leadership before it launched a motivated criticism, should have done a some homework as to what you were doing for six years, but I am now doing it for you. Sir, there was another meeting on September 20th. On page 172, this book says, "during a private dinner with Jaswant in New York, I registered a strong objection to the draft nuclear doctrine Mishra had presented in August--now, Mishra was Brajesh Mishra, the National Security Adviser--, Jaswant replied that since the paper had no imprimatur from the Government, it should not be taken too seriously. It was not really even a doctrine--it was just a set of recommendations that Vajpayee would almost certainly not accept. The United States should not "dignify" it--you nuclear doctrine, you say so--by overreacting. India could not possibly afford a strategic triad. Its nuclear arsenal would "reside in a passive deployment." What were you sermonising us on? National pride? How to engage US? We have engaged with sense of responsibility. We have engaged them in a very open and transparent manner. The Prime Minister, through his statement, I thought, clarified all the misgivings, or the doubts which were expressed by those who had genuine doubts. Here, I will say that when criticism is there, some of the criticism can be *bonafide*. Some of the misgivings can be

bonafide, but some of it is, definitely, not *bonafide*, that is what emanated from the BJP side.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anand Sharma, you have to conclude in another three minutes.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, just give me five minutes. Sir, allow me. I can assure that between Ambikaji and me, together we have taken less time than Sushmaji...*(interruptions)*... Please bear with me just for a few minutes. Sir, there was also a reference, made not by Sushmaji alone. My dear friend, Mr. Nilotpal also had certain misgivings on one count whether it compromises our nuclear programme in any manner. A reference was made to the thorium being used as a nuclear fuel for future. I am sure that our scientists would be better informed and they would be working on it. But it has become important that the Prime Minister, Sir, at least, once again reassures--though we have no doubt, but for those who have any doubt--that our fast breeder reactor programme will continue, rather will gain momentum, and our nuclear scientists will continue to search for the right technology so that thorium, which is available in abundance, can be used for nuclear energy generation in future.

Sir, about Indo-US relations, I would just say a few words because it is important. There has been a qualitative change. Now, why are we engaging the US? The US is a important country; it is a pre-eminent power. Nations' relations and perceptions about each other cannot remain frozen. We are a vibrant nation; the world is vibrant. We are moving forward. Today, we are talking of the 21st Century. Our leaders, when Jawaharlal Nehru was there, when Indira Gandhi was there, yes, they had a world vision, and so did Rajiv Gandhi on nuclear disarmament. We have not shifted away from that. We remain committed to that truce. But engaging the US, deepening our relationship and cooperation with them, why should it be objectionable? Even I would say, with all humility, to our friends from the Left that in 1971 when relations were very bad between the US and China, Kissinger went there and engaged China, and that helped China, in many respects, to emerge out of isolation. If we have a strategic understanding or partnership with the US, it must not be viewed in isolation. It should not be construed as a 360 degree turn. What is being said is that there is a basic departure. If we are engaging the United States of America, we are also engaging other major powers. We have a strategic relationship with Russia, which is again a P-5 country. We have also reached a similar understanding with the EU. We have an understanding with the ASEAN. Then there is the IBSA initiative—India, Brazil and South Africa. When we say that we have

given up, forsaken our commitment to multi-polarity only by engaging with the United States of America, this is a travesty of the truth. This Government remains committed, in a very pragmatic manner, to ensure that India plays its rightful role in the comity of the nations. Now I will come, lastly, Sir, to the UN reforms and the UN Security Council. Did the Prime Minister say before he left, 'I am going there to plead with America to support India?' No. The Prime Minister made a very clear, very firm statement even when he addressed the US Congress, and it is our conviction that for the United Nations to have a representative character, it cannot ignore a country like India. The UN Security Council will have a representative character, if India is there. If India is not there, then, there will be a question mark put on that. But we are part of the G-4 initiative, and the G-4 Resolution is there. That is being discussed and debated. Our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister have been talking with leaders all over the world. Sir, India was not taking a position of pleading alone. India was taking a principled stand along with other countries, which, also have a claim, in addition to G-4 also the representation of Africa. That is what India has been stating and fighting for.

Let me say, Sir, when this debate was notified after the Prime Minister's statement, and I say it with all sincerity, I never thought that this will be an occasion to score political points. I thought this will be an occasion for an informed debated. But to my shock, it opened up with deliberate criticism, with a criticism which was unfounded, ill-informed, and that has compelled me to make some references to that period. Sir, I will not talk of our strength because, our strength is not the strength of this side or the strength of that side. Our achievements are not based on the notion that it is only we who have done it. There are the achievements of the leaders and the people of India. If India is a nuclear power, the credit goes to the scientists; the credit goes to the vision of Jawaharlal Nehru and Bhaba. That is how we have arrived where we stand today. पर सुषमा जी ने कमजोरी की बात कही। सुषमा जी, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि आपने ताकत और कमजोरी के बारे में पंजाबी की एक कहावत इस हाऊस के अंदर सुना दी है कि दुनिया, जोर वालों के सामने झुकती है। हमने कभी दुनिया को झुकाने की और जोर की बात तो नहीं की, पर दुनिया ने तब भी 1971 में लोहा माना था, जब इंदिरा गांधी झुकी नही थीं और बंगला देश आजाद हुआ था। हमने कभी उससे समझौता नहीं किया, लेकिन वह आपके शासन काल में हुआ था, जब आपने एक दिन आर-पार की लड़ाई की बात कही और अगले ही दिन आपके प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कहा कि आसमान साफ हो गया है। आपने 10 लाख फौज, 10 महीनों तक भारत की सीमा पर खड़ी रखी और कोई फैसला नहीं। So, let us not be given lessons on strength. Let us talk in a responsible manner.

Sir, I feel that when it comes to national interest, we must talk in one voice. It should not be dragged into partisan politics. What our opponents and critics are saying—those who were questioning the Prime Minister's motives and also achievements, or the joint statement—is reflective of their mindset—the mindset of insecurity, the mindset of suspicion, the mindset of inferiority complex. We do not have that mindset. We have self confidence. We do not suffer from insecurity or inferiority complex. We are the inheritors of a very proud heritage and we are confident that this country, of 1.1 billion with the fourth largest economy, cannot be tossed around, cannot be made a client State.

Therefore, I would urge upon our friends on the other side, please, let there be unanimity in applauding the Prime Minister's visit. Accept it. Do not go by motivated criticism. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manoj Bhattacharya, you have four minutes.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal): Sir, he must be given more time.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Sir, I must submit with all humility that it is not my failure. it is the failure of the scientists that they could invent measures to magnify small things and observe it properly. But until now, the scientists have not been able to invent measures that would enable big things to be brought into a small framework, so that it could be analysed. So, it is the failure of the scientists; it is not my failure. I am also suffering from the same problem, since I am waiting for the scientists to develop that mechanism so that these big things could be brought into a small frame, and I could speak out.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Sir, I must express my thanks to the hon. Prime Minister. The time allotted to me is very meagre, and I would not be doing justice to myself or to my party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, if I comment on this extensively. But I must thank the hon. Prime Minister for, at least, giving me a *suo moto* statement on the joint agreement or understanding that has been arrived at during his recent visit to the United States of America.

Sir, this is a very long statement, a five-and-a-quater-page statement, and if I wish to proceed para-wise, I would not be able to complete it, because there is no time at my disposal.

Sir, to my understanding—and I am sure that you would also kindly agree with me—the position taken by the Left is a little different. The position taken by the Left has been brought out well by my friend, Shri Nilotpal Basu, in this House during the pre-lunch session. I would just add a few words to that and I would seek some clarification from the hon. Prime Minister. He may kindly clarify them, if possible.

Sir, to me, the irony is that the Bush administration has believed in unilateralism all through, and India has always believed in multilateralism. We have not believed, India has never believed, in unilateralism. So, there is a contradiction between unilateralism and multilateralism. Now, it seems quite ironical to me—how can we have terms of reference as reciprocity, as sharing of values? What values shall we share? The Americans profess a different set of values. The values prompt Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger to call our great leader, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, an *. or, Indians as a nation of some.... I do not wish to utter that word here. We never repeat it or reciprocate it. We do never reciprocate. If they do like this, what shall we reciprocate? How, can we share values; I do not really understand. Sir, moreover, the Bush Administration, in particular – I do not absolve or exonerate the Clinton Administration or earlier Administration – has a State policy that they have been hegemonistic; they have been imperialists. Their attitude has been of subjugation of other weaker countries, demolishing the democracy, trampling upon the human rights to subserve their own interests. But, India's policy has always been reverse to this. India has never been a colonial country. If I recall the history of thousand years, I do not find any instance that India has ever been hegemonistic; India has ever been imperialist; India has ever been colonialist. So, I do not understand that what is the reciprocity. Where from does this term 'reciprocity' comes? On what shall we reciprocate? And, what are the shared values? I am sure that hon. Prime Minister, for whom I have got very high personal admiration, will kindly clarify on this. Sir, what are the common concerns of mankind in India? In para 2, he has kindly mentioned about the common concerns and challenges. Now, what are the challenges? (*Time-bell*) I have been given four minutes' time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, four minutes have been given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those four minutes are over.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: No, Sir. Your watch is running very fast. However, let me not waste my time. Kindly bear with me. So, what are the common concerns and challenges that India and USA share except terrorism?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, finish within two minutes.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Yes, Sir, I am trying to finish. Sir, does not concept of present form of terrorism exclude the State terrorism? What is it that USA indulges in most? Shall we not retrospect that it is the USA which has given birth to this terrorism, the present form of terrorism, right from the Afghan War days, Taliban, the Osama Bin Laden? Is it not the USA which invaded Iraq? How shall we address these common concerns and challenges? Sir, what could be the shared values and interests between India and the USA when the USA firmly advances the cause of blood and aggression on different nations and trampling upon human rights and India's values are diametrically opposite? Sir, because of our independence movement, our freedom struggle, India has been an anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist nation. Sir, with these words, I shall only ask the hon. Prime Minister, if possible, to clarify on this. Personally, I am against it because I consider this to be a single important factor of destabilising peace in this world, that is, division of atom. Einstein, who was the great nuclear scientist, also lamented about this. In fact, after Manhattan project, after seeing that the catastrophe created by atom bomb, Einstein himself lamented, he repented that division of atom should not be there. Sir, we should search for the alternative energy sources. In fact, America itself, after 1996, – if my information goes correct I must be corrected if I am wrong – has not advanced any nuclear power plant. And, wherever they have tried, Sir, I do have the definite information, the people of America have stood against it because it is against them. It is against the environment, it is against humanity. (*Time-bell*) I am just concluding. Sir, I would also like to understand the difference between the peaceful use of atom and also the military use of atom. Because, if my information goes correct, even in the first Pokhran blast of 1974, the fuel came from the same safe guarded plant at Tarapur. Tarapur is for civil use of nuclear power. So, the fuel had to come, the plutonium had to come from Tarapur to Pokhran and the blast could be completed. So, Sir, what is the difference? How do we demarcate between the civil use of nuclear energy and also the military use of nuclear energy? I would like to ask all these questions. I would propose that we should have a full-fledged discussion on the use of nuclear power. Thank you, Sir.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार): माननीय सभापति महोदय, प्रधानमंत्री जी ने संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका से जो समझौता किया है, उसके लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देना चाहता हूं। माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी बधाई के पात्र इसलिए हैं कि हम 1971 को जानते हैं, जब अमेरिका ने हमारे साथ बुरा बर्ताव किया था। लेकिन अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर जो शक्ति संतुलन था, उसमें हमें सोवियत संघ के खेमे में माना जाता था। वर्ष 1974 में जब पोखरन (प्रथम) हुआ तब भी सोवियत संघ अस्तित्व में था और हमारा कोई स्वतंत्र अस्तित्व नहीं माना जाता था व हम को सोवियत संघ के खेमे में माना जाता था। वर्ष 1998 में जब पोखरन (द्वितीय) किया गया, उस समय सोवियत संघ का अस्तित्व समाप्त हो चुका था। हम किसी खेमे में नहीं रहे, लेकिन अमेरिका ने फिर हमारे साथ वही व्यवहार किया और हम पर प्रतिबंध लगा दिया। मान्यवर, हमारे समाजवादी आंदोलन के नेता श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र जी अभी सदन में नहीं हैं। मैं उनके भाषण के बहुत से अंशों से सहमत नहीं हूं, लेकिन उन्होंने चीन का उल्लेख, श्री बसु का उल्लेख करते हुए कहा है। मान्यवर, आशंका व्यक्त की गयी है कि अमेरिका के साथ जो आप का समझौता हुआ है, उसमें अमेरिका, चीन के खिलाफ भारत का इस्तेमाल करना चाहेगा। मान्यवर, भारत का इस्तेमाल तो नहीं होगा क्योंकि सोवियत संघ नहीं है, लेकिन हमारा स्वतंत्र अस्तित्व अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर कायम हो गया है। इस समझौते से भारत की सकारात्मक भूमिका साबित हुई है, लेकिन 1998 में जब पोखरन (द्वितीय) हुआ था तो संयुक्त राष्ट्र महासभा में जो प्रस्ताव तैयार हुआ था, उसमें चीन का इस्तेमाल भारत के खिलाफ अमेरिका ने किया था। वह प्रस्ताव तैयार करने में चीन का इस्तेमाल हुआ था, लेकिन आज जो समझौता हुआ है, उसमें अमेरिका ने भारत पर लगे प्रतिबंध को हटाया है। इस समझौते से साबित हो गया है कि भारत सिर्फ विकासशील देश नहीं हैं, हम एक उदीयमान राष्ट्र हैं। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर पारस्परिक सहयोग के आधार पर हमारे साथ पहले जो अमेरिका का व्यवहार होता था, अमेरिका ने अब परस्पर सहयोग के आधार पर हमारे साथ व्यवहार कर के समझौता किया है। इस समझौते के बाद हमारे प्रधानमंत्री का जो मान-सम्मान हुआ है, यह महज प्रधानमंत्री का मान-सम्मान नहीं है, किसी राष्ट्र का मान-सम्मान है और राष्ट्र की जो ताकत बढ़ी है, उसको स्वीकारने का मान-सम्मान है। इसलिए तीसरा मौका हमारे प्रधानमंत्री को मिला, जो किसी-किसी देश के राष्ट्र प्रमुख को अमेरिका के प्रेसीडेंट के साथ साउथ लॉन में भाषण देने पर मिलता है। हमारे प्रधानमंत्री ने अमेरिका के प्रेसीडेंट के साथ वहां संयुक्त अधिवेशन को सम्बोधित किया। अमेरिका ने हमारे ऊपर से प्रतिबंध उठाया, अमेरिका द्वारा जो परमाणु एवं उच्च प्रौद्योगिकी की आपूर्ति पर जो प्रतिबंध लगा था, अब वह आपूर्ति हम कहीं से लेंगे। पहले 1998 में मान्यवर प्रधानमंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने जब यह घोषणा की थी कि हम परमाणु राष्ट्र बन गए, तो अमेरिका ने सबसे पहले कहा था कि हम भारत को परमाणु संपन्न राष्ट्र नहीं मानते हैं। अभी जो प्रधानमंत्री जी ने समझौता किया है, उस पर अमेरिका ने कहा है कि हम भारत को परमाणु संपन्न राष्ट्र मानते हैं। यह एक बड़ी उपलब्धि हुई है। हमारे राष्ट्र का गौरव बढ़ा है और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर भारत को जो सकारात्मक भूमिका निभानी है, उसकी बुनियाद माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने रखी है। इसलिए यह समझौता न सिर्फ ऐतिहासिक

समझौता है बल्कि एक नया अध्याय आरम्भ हुआ है और भारत व अमेरिका के बीच में जो अविश्वास की चादर थी, उसे हटाने का काम हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने किया है। मान्यवर, जो नया अध्याय खुला है, उसमें एक नया ऐतिहासिक श्रीगणेश अमेरिका के साथ संबंधों में होगा।

महोदय, अभी श्री मनोज भट्टाचार्य ने तारापुर की चर्चा की। मैंने प्रधानमंत्री जी का भाषण कई बार सुना है, उनकी चिंता हम ने कई बार अखबारों में पढ़ी है। उन्होंने नाभिकीय ऊर्जा पर, परमाणु ऊर्जा पर बल दिया है कि बुनियादी ढांचे के लिए ऊर्जा की जो हमारी कमी है, उस में परमाणु ऊर्जा सबसे ज्यादा अहम महत्व रखती है। अभी उन्होंने स्वयं कहा है कि 10 हजार मेगावाट क्षमता हमको प्राप्त करनी चाहिए थी, लेकिन अभी हम 3 हजार तक ही पहुंचे हैं। महोदय, यह जो समझौता हुआ है, उससे हम तारापुर या दूसरे संयंत्रों के लिए, अमेरिका, फ्रांस और दूसरे देशों से, जब हमको अमेरिका ने परमाणु-सम्पन्न राष्ट्र मान लिया है, ईंधन प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं मानता हूं कि यह जो समझौता हुआ है, यह ऐतिहासिक है।

हमारी भी एक बात की शंका है, जो हमारे समाजवादी आन्दोलन के नेता श्री जनेश्वर जी ने कही है। हम अमेरिका की दादागिरी के खिलाफ रहे हैं। यह हमारा समजावादी आंदोलन का परम्परागत संस्कार है। यह बात ठीक है कि सुरक्षा परिषद में हमारी सदस्यता हो, अमेरिका ने वादा किया था या नहीं किया था, लेकिन अमेरिका ने परोक्ष रूप से यह संकेत दिया था, लेकिन अमेरिका ने वह पूरा नहीं किया।...(समय की घंटी)... हमें वीटो के लिए लड़ाई नहीं लड़नी चाहिए और हमें सुरक्षा परिषद में सदस्य नहीं बनाया गया है, इसके बारे में प्रधान मंत्री जी को पूरी स्थिति इस सदन में रखनी चाहिए। इन्हीं बातों के साथ, मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूं। महोदय, आपका बार-बार इशारा हो रहा है। मैं पुनः अपने माननीय प्रधानमंत्री आदरणीय डा॰ मनमोहन सिंह को इसके लिए बधाई देता हूं, धन्यवाद देता हूं।

SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN (Nominated): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir, for these few minutes that you have given me. I must first of all congratulate those who have participated so far, and, I must, particularly, compliment my good friend, Mr. Nilotpal Basu, for the points he made so effectively and so eloquently. Since, there were some comments at the beginning on English semantics and different joint statements by different Governments, let me say, at the outset, that the semantics of the opening sentence in the Indo-US Joint Statement, which I wish had been circulated along with the hon. Prime Minister's statement, dissolves all doubts. It says, and I read it for the benefit of the hon. Members, "Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and President Bush today declared their resolve to transform the relationship between their countries and establish a global partnership". Not to reaffirm tneir relationship, but to transform it, that is, take it into new fields. That, in my opinion, is the single most important part of the document and the rest of which has to be read in the context of

this sentence. And transforming global partnership, I have read very carefully, is not subject to any law to be made or to be unmade by the United States Congress. In my humble opinion, the opening sentence in this Joint Statement resolves doubts about the status of our respective two States. As reflected in the Statement, we are on a footing of quality not of tutelage. And, whatever little I understand about international diplomacy, which is very little, it is that when Heads of State of two different countries sign a Joint Statement, they do not set out areas of their disagreement. Hence, you will find only one sentence on international terrorism which reads, "The conclusion of the UN Convention on International Terrorism proposed by India at an early date was deemed to be a priority of both countries". To me, this sentence is pregnant with the affirmation that each of us has maintained our respective positions on global terrorism. Lastly, Sir, one sentence in the Joint Statement is the reason why I sought for few minutes in this discussion session and it reads, "The President reiterated his view that international institutions are going to have to adapt to reflect India's central and growing role." Obviously, President Bush meant the United Nations. My point, Sir, is, if international institutions are to adapt to reflect India's growing role, India must respond. But, to play an increasing role on the world stage, it is necessary for India to be UN Convention compliant. We should satisfy the conventions that we have already signed. We do not have any Constitutional impediments of parliamentary approval to conventions which are signed to be ratified. And, I particularly refer, Sir, to the Torture Convention. I was fortunate enough and privileged enough to join a parliamentary delegation a few weeks ago to Strasbourg. Several Members of the European Parliament asked us quite pointedly, to which I had very little to say, "You have signed the Torture Covention, why haven't you ratified it?" Because we do not have a constitutional impediment that our Parliament has to ratify, it is the Executive that ratifies it. So, if you signed a convention, you should ratify it. This will certainly imporve our image on the world stage, especially when we have nothing to hide in the matter of this Torture Convention. That is all I wish to say, Sir. Thank you.

DR. P.C. ALEXANDER (Maharashtra): Sir, in any agreement between two countries, there are bound to be certain areas with which one country may not agree, and certain areas with which the other country may not agree. I do not think there has been any bilateral agreement, which can be claimed to have satisfied both sides on all the points. What I mean to say is that the nation should be prepared to accept a joint Statement or an agreement which may not be satisfactory to us in certain respects, but

4.00 P.M.

which may be accepted because it satisfies us in certain important areas. What I wish, therefore, to bring before the House today is not the points on which we feel happy or on which we feel unhappy. This has been done very well by previous speakers. But what I wish to deal with is that having signed this agreement, there are certain areas where we have to be a little careful. I would say a lot to be careful. We have to be really vigilant. I want to bring out the past experience of our country with the Unites States, in particular about the Tarapore Project and supply of Nuclear Fuel.

From that experience, we should learn this great lesson. And that is this. Okay, we go with this, but we should remain very, very careful. The experiences of the past convince us that if we are not careful, we can be tripped into one bad situation, and from that into a worse situation. I will just mention our experience.

In 1963, we had signed a solemn agreement with the United States for supplying nuclear fuel for Tarapore for 30 years. It was to go on till 2003. After Pokhran I, the U.S. started twisting us, breaking our bones, putting us in the dark house, putting us in a corner, in practically 20-25 major areas of concerns to us. One of them was passing a legislation in the U.S. Congress regarding stopping supply of nuclear fuel to India. We got terribly frightened at this prospect of having to close down the Tarapore Plant. The then Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, was going to visit the United States in 1982 somewhere near the end of July and beginning of August. The mandate given to us by her was that before we leave, we shall try to sort out all issues, particularly Tarapore issue.

Tortuous negotiations were held with the American Ambassador and his advisor by people like me, the Foreign Secretary, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Cabinet Secretary. They always turned back to us with this argument —"The President wants to give you the Tarapore fuel without interruption, but we have to be very careful about the Congress' attitude. And unless we take the Congress also with us, there will be trouble. Therefore, you give us something more in return." We told them that it was an agreement signed and valid till 2003, and we could not be asked to make any concession. But they did not agree to it. Finally after a lot of arguments, we reached a settlement at official level saying that a third country will take this obligation. That third country was France, which had no difficulty on the point of view of a legislation by parliament. So, we thought it was an excellent arrangement.

I have referred to that in my article in the *Asian Age* today. After the

American Ambassador left my office, I telephoned, in the presence of my colleague, the Prime Minister, who was camping in Kashmir at that time. She conveyed her approval but asked a pertinent question; "Are you quite sure that you have a firm agreement or will there be trouble?" I, with all vehemence, said that there will be no trouble whatsoever and this is a *pucca* agreement. And look, what happened? A few days later, we landed in Washington. A team, ahead of us, had gone to Washington to tie the loosens, while the Prime Minister's main party awaits in Washington. The first thing that we saw in 3-4 newspapers in Washington, quoting reliable sources of the State Department saying that India has agreed, in return for supply of nuclear fuel, to stop and to forego the right to reprocess fuel. We got terribly frightened again. After long arguments, after concluding a settlement in a very solemn manner, we go to the United States and suddenly, we are told that we are agreed to sign another agreement, that is, to give up or forego the right to reprocess fuel. Again, we rushed to the State Department and told them that we are not going to sign any agreement and we will go back without the Tarapore fuel commitment from you and we will see what happens. Then, finally, they agreed that we will get fuel from France. From that experience, 23 years ago, I wish to warn the Prime Minister. He is a very experienced administrator himself. I don't have to give him an advice. But I would warn the Atomic Energy Commission and others concerned with this, that at any stage in implementation, we may be asked to give something more in return for what they had already agreed. That has been our past experience. I am not questioning the sincerity of President Bush when he made that commitment to our Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh. President Bush may be quite sincere in his commitments he has made in the Joint Statement. But, the Congress is something which the President cannot control. The Prime Minister, according to our Constitution, can commit our country to any decision, so long as he holds the majority of the Parliament. Nobody can make him go back on a commitment he has made so long as he has the majority support in the Parliament. But the President of America is in a different position. He can make a commitment to Dr. Manmohan Singh and later, after a year or two, he can always say "I have failed in my attempt, I have teleponed my friends in the Congress, I have done this, I have done that, but the Congress wants this assurance from you or that condition to be satisfied by you." Therefore, we have to remain conscious of that.

I only want to say one thing more, Sir, again from our past experience. The media and Junior officers, who go with the Prime Minister on foreign tours, should not unnecessarily create a hype that we are going to make

a historic agreement when we reach there, we are going to get this or get that. Nobody should be giving out such statements before the Prime Minister himself makes the final statement, either there or when he comes here. Unfortunately, if we create a hype that something great is going to be achieved and we are going to come back victorious, we weaken ourselves in bargaining. Because they know that these people will not go back without giving something and, therefore, they try to extract the maximum from you. We have to be cautious about these two things. I am sorry, I appear to be advising a very experienced administrator of the country, who is also a great economist and a great leader. But, in a humble spirit, based on our own country's experience, I thought I shall bring these two warnings before him. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Shri Ashwani Kumar.

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR (Punjab): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir. Sir, in view of the paucity of time, let me, as a one-time exception, stake the burden of my exertions at the threshold. Sir, I do believe that the Prime Minister's visit to the United States and the Joint Indo-US Declaration is an unqualified triumph. I had hoped, Sir, that in celebrating this national triumph, the Opposition would not suborn contemporaneous sagacity to the rhetoric of the past. I was disappointed as always. I had also hopes that in this landmark, evolving transforming relationship with the United States, the distinguished leaders of the opposition parties would not fail to see the implicit and explicit recognition of India as a pre-eminent emerging global power. This is not only reflected in the unprecedented welcome accorded to our Prime Minister, which must do us all proud, but it is also to be seen that in a series of wide-ranging agreements that our Prime Minister could achieve and, in a sense, he could do so because he succeeded, if I may say so, in all humility, in harnessing all the factors of national power in aid of our national interest. Sushmaji in her intervention used a Punjabi saying, "Duniya Mandi Zoran Di". It is so right, Sushmaji. Had it not been for the strength of the nation that the Prime Minister succeeded in demonstrating in the US, we would not have got what we did. It is time for this House, it is time for this country not only to applaud the Prime Minister but also to applaud the strength of the nation as a whole, which got recognised in the series of agreements that we achieved.

I have stated my conclusion at the threshold. I must, therefore, make it good. I must tell this House what is it that we have achieved. They are, very briefly, Sir, the initiative on agricltural research and practices, a scienctific framework for expanded research and training, building up on a

leverage as the leadership of the knowledge industry, a forward movement in the early conclusion of the UN Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism, an objective, a world view, that we share with the United States and, above all, cooperation in civil nuclear energy.

Now, a great deal of time was spent by Sushmaji in saying that we have got nothing but promises. No, Sushmaji. We have not got only promises. We have got results and they are here for all of us to see. Fuel for Tarapur in Rajashtan is available. Three ISRO units, one unit in Bangalore and the Space Application Centre in Ahmedabad, were removed from the Entity List. The US has agreed to refrain from vetoing fuel supplies by other countries to Inida. India's claim for participation in ITER fusion programme and the generation for advanced reactors is to be considered. Now, much was said that we had got only a promise of consideration. I ask myself and I ask Sushmaji, with all deference and with all respect, whether we have, in the last 30 years, got even a promise of consideration. It is a definite move forward and I must say that I, as a citizen, as Congress man, as a nationalist, could not have hoped for more, considering the legacy of our relationship with the U.S.

I have to make this point and I say this with all the conviction at my command. Sushmaji quoted Dr. Prasad *in extenso*. I have the utmost respect for Dr. Prasad. Can I also then cite Dr. Anil Kakodkar? Can I cite Dr. A Gopalakrishnan, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board? Can I cite Shri Subrahmaniam, the leading defence analyst? If you needed Nicholas Bern to interpret this statement of our Prime Minister, then I would like to remind this House what Walter Anderson, A Senior Fellow at the John Hopkins, has stated. He said that India had got a sweet deal. He said that, in 30 years, for once the US had diluted its stand on the NPT and nuclear proliferation image of India.

Sir, two more minutes and I have done. This is the last denouement of the opposition which comes from the Opposition Benches to the Joint Statement. Sushmaji stated something extremely outrageous, if I may say so. Normally, she doesn't do that. She stated that the Prime Minister of India had been led to an ambush. I think a statement or an insinuation to that effect is a great disservice to the collective wisdom and sagacity of the Indian people. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I cannot better the conclusion than by using the words of the Prime Minsiter himself. He said, "Our inheritance gives us confidence, our experience gives us courage and our belief gives us conviction to assert today that our nation stands on the threshold of an even better future." I could not agree

more, Sir. In conclusion, I salute you, Mr. Prime Minister, for securing, as always, dignity, autonomy and prestige of India. Thank you.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (झारखंड): सभापति महोदय, इससे पहले कि मैं अपनी बात कहूं मेरे कहने का यह मतलब कभी न समझा जाए कि डा॰ मनमोहन सिंह जी की देशभक्ति या कांग्रेस की देशभक्ति पर मैं कोई शक कर रहा हूं। दरअसल, मैं जो कुछ बोल रहा हूं वह कांग्रेस के लोगों से और कांग्रेस के नेताओं ने ही जिस देश को सिखाया और इसमें मैं पंडित जवाहर लाल जी का और इन्दिरा जी का नाम विशेष रूप से ले रहा हूं कि राष्ट्र का स्वाभिमान देश की दौलत से, देश के रिएक्टर चलाने से ज्यादा बड़ा होता है। मैं उसी आधार पर इस बात को कह रहा हूं और यह बात 1949 में जब पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू पहली बार अमेरिका गए थे और उन्होंने जब वहां के तत्कालीन राष्ट्रपति ट्रूमैन से अपनी बात कही थी और ट्रूमैन साहब ने उनसे कहा था कि आपको जितना लोहा लेना है, जितना काम कराना है, हमसे करा लीजिए, लेकिन कोई लोहे की फैक्टरी, इस्पात की फैक्टरी बैठाने की जरूरत नहीं है। तब जवाहर लाल जी ने ट्रूमैन से कहा था कि हमने राष्ट्र को स्वावलम्बन के आधार पर आजाद कराया है और उस आजादी की हमें बहुत बड़ी कीमत चुकानी पड़ी है, इसलिए हम किसी भी कीमत पर उन शर्तों को स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे, जिन शर्तों की ट्रूमैन साहब आप बात कर रहे है। इसलिए मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी के संसद में दिए हुए बयान की-जो आखिरी पंक्ति है, मैं वहीं से अपनी बात शुरू करना चाहता हूं, जहां पर डा॰ मनमोहन सिंह जी के मून में यह विश्वास है कि हम आर्थिक, सामाजिक प्रगति अमेरिका के साथ मिलकर करना चाहते हैं इस देश में मैं सदन के माध्यम से जानना चाहता हूं कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी, इस देश में जब भी संकट का कोई दौर आया तो कौन-सा ऐसा समय था जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका हमारे साथ खड़ा हुआ था? विपत्ति के कई दौर आए जिनको हमने देखा और हर मौके पर हमने यह पाया कि हमारे साथ खड़े होने की बात तो दूर हमारा साथ तक देना भी उन्होंने मुनासिब नहीं समझा। इसलिए जब गैर बराबरी आधार पर आप कोई समझौता करके आए हों, अपनी बात कह कर आए हो, तो हमारे जैसे लोगों के मन में थोड़ा दुख होता है। अब आपने कहा कि ऊर्जा के स्रोत के लिए सबसे ज्यादा जरूरी था कि अमेरिका से हमारा यह समझौता हो। हम जानना चाहेंगे कि ऊर्जा के स्रोत के लिए आपने इतनी बड़ी कुर्बानी दी। ऊर्जा के लिए हमारे पास जो आज भी हमारी जरूरत है उसमें कितना ऊर्जा का स्रोत - न्यूक्लिअर स्रोत, हमारा तीन प्रतिशत ऊर्जा का स्रोत - न्यूक्लिअर स्रोत है और उसके लिए आपने वह काम किया जिसके लिए यह देश अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होने का दम हमेशा भरता रहा है। यह देश हमेशा कहता रहा है कि हम किसी भी कीमत पर बराबरी के साथ समझौता नहीं कर सकते और मुझको लगता है कि वहां जो काम हुआ है उससे बराबरी पर समझौता हुआ है। हम आपसे इतना ही अर्ज करना चाहेंगे प्रधान मंत्री जी, कि जो कुछ काम आप करके आए हैं उसके बारे में यह सदन को बताएं तो हमारे जैसे लोगों को संतुष्टि होगी। एक बात तो मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या एडिशनल प्रोटोकॉल में अमेरिका ने यह बात कही है कि उनका समझौता हुआ है उसमें कि हम अपनी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा में किसी तरह का सिविल और मिलिट्री डिफेंशियेसन नहीं होने

देंगे। राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के लिए न तो उनके लिए सिविल का कोई मतलब है और न उनके लिए मिलिट्री का कोई मतलब है। हकीकत में यह है कि उनके यहां न तो सिविल और मिलिट्री न्यूक्लिअर कामों में कोई अंतर है। यह दो बातों को बहुत स्पष्ट रूप से एडिशनल प्रोटोकॉल में कहा गया है और जिस लिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि आप मुझे यह बताएं कि हमारी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा में जो हमारे कई साथियों ने कहा, खास करके इधर से कहा गया, ओक्जेन्डर साहब ने कहा जो पुराना अनुभव है, उस आधार पर हम जिन कामों को करते हैं, उन कामों में सिविल मिलिट्री ऐसा जुड़ा हुआ है एक दूसरे से जिसमें यह डिफ्रेंशिएट करना कि हमारा कौन-सा काम सिविल से होता था और कौन-सा काम मिलट्री डिटरेंट के लिए होता था, उसमें भेद करना एक कठिन काम है। क्या राष्ट्र उतनी बड़ी कीमत चुकाने के लिए तैयार है जो कीमत हमें बताया जाता है कि अगर यह अलग किया गया तो उसकी कीमत बहुत बड़ी हो जाएगी। इसलिए मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि देखने में तो ऊर्जा का स्त्रोत न्यूक्लिअर आपके लिए बड़ा लग रहा हो, लेकिन हमारे जो मंत्री जी ने एक बयान दिया था इस सदन के अंदर कि 2010 तक हम टेन थाउजेंड मेगावाट न्यूक्लिअर प्लांट बनाना चाहते हैं, क्या यह सम्भव है? यह कभी भी सम्भव नहीं हो सकता। आप ज्यादा से ज्यादा तीन हजार मेगावाट और बना सकते हो। अमेरिका के पास कुल मिलाकर के 250 से ज्यादा रिएक्टर है और हमारे पास कुल मिलाकर 15 और 9 हैं तथा उनमें 18 हैवी वाटर से हैं। हम आपसे जानना चाहते हैं कि आप संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका से सचमुच चाहते क्या हैं? कंक्रीट टर्म में आप चाहते क्या हैं? जो हमारे रिएक्टर चल रहे हैं, उनमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका की बहुत मदद की जरूरत नहीं है। जिस फ्यूल के बारे में आप चर्चा करते हैं, उस फ्यूल की जरूरत वहां से नहीं है। हम तो अपना चला ही रहे हैं, स्वयं चला रहे है, उसमें किसी की मदद की जरूरत नहीं है। अगर सचमुच में अमेरिका हमारी मदद करना चाहता है, तो वह जो मित्र देश हैं, उनके सहयोग को और अगर बढ़ावा दें, तो हमारा काम आसानी से हो सकता है..।

श्री सभापति: बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: उस पर आपने...।

श्री सभापति: बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: सभापति जी, मैं एक मिनट में समाप्त कर रहा हूं। इस पर आपने कौन-सा कंक्रीट, उनसे यह पूछा है कि वह किस तरह से इसमें आगे काम करना चाहते हैं...।

श्री सभापति: बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। अब टाइम पूरा हो गया है।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: सभापति जी, मैं सिर्फ एक बात पूछना चाहूंगा। प्रधान मंत्री जी जो टेरेरिज्म के बारे में समझौता करके आये हैं। एक ऐसा देश है, जिसने उसके सामने कभी झुकना पसंद नहीं किया, उस देश को उसने नेस्तनाबूद कर दिया। उसके बारे में इसी संसद में हम सब लोगों ने प्रस्ताव पास किया था। अब वह हमसे कहता है कि आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने में उसे हमारा साथ चाहिए। हमारे आतंकवाद के दर्द में तो कभी उन्होंने दर्द का अहसास नहीं किया, हम तो पिछले

15 वर्षों से आतंकवाद से लड़ रहे हैं, संसद तक उसकी गवाह बनी है। फिर भी, उससे कोई सहयोग और सहायता हमें नहीं मिली, उनका आतंकवाद उनके अपने दम्भ के लिए होता है और उस दम्भ में अगर हमारा इस्तेमाल हुआ, हम उनके सहयोगी बने, तो यकीनन भारत की जो इज्जत और गरिमा दुनिया में बनी है, वह नष्ट होगी। हम इसके लिए आपसे चाहते हैं कि आप देश को भी विश्वास में लें।

श्री सभापति: बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: मैं अंत में यह कहना चाहूंगा।

श्री सभापति: बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहूंगा कि ऊर्जा के स्रोत से कुछ समय तक के लिए देश में बिजली लाई जा सकती है।...(**समय की घंटी**)... लेकिन ऊर्जा के स्रोत से देश के स्वाभिमान को नहीं बढ़ाया जा सकता है। इसलिए फिर से, हमको उन्हीं नीतियों पर अपने को मजबूत करना होगा, जो पंडित पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने इस सदन के माध्यम से और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों से दुनिया को बताने का काम किया था। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY: Mr. Chiarman, Sir, I think the hon. Prime Minister went to the U.S. at a very significant time because he went at a time when the capabilities of India are changing, and, perhaps, the past experience does not hold good as it might have been earlier. Yes; the U.S. has not been very co-operative with us in the past. But, I think he went with a number of strengths behind him. Firstly, he went representing a growing economy in which the U.S.A has got an economic interest. He went as a major technology power. But, above all, he went as representative of a power of an aspect which was not highlighted. We are nuclear weapons power in spite of sanctions against us; we are a missile power in spite of sanctions against us. And today, when we talk of a multipolar world, we are a new challenger in the field. We went as a representative of a new challenger in the field of power because we ourselves are becoming a pole in this multi-polar world. And, I think, the hon. Prime Minister had a very difficult task; he had a very sensitive task, and I think, he had to do a lot of adroit, tight-rope walking to ensure that in this changing world, India, which has got a growing clout, should utilise that clout to extract from the U.S.A. as much as we are able to at this stage. Questions are always asked: What are the common values we have with the U.S.A? What are the common aims has the U.S.A. got with us? What is the terrorism that we are fighting? Well; let us take terrorism firstly. The enemy is common; that is, fundamentalist ideology--whether it is for the U.S. or for India. Today we

are talking about Iraq. Iraq is an event which we condemn. But when we talk of Afghanistan, surely, we cannot condemn Afghanistan totally because a lot of things that were done in Afghanistan by the U.S. for which we did not have the capability of doing has worked to our interest. And when we talk of terrorism, we do not add on Iraq and Afghanistan, and we do not add on Kashmir. The enemy in all three is the same and that is the common point we have with USA. Yes, USA has not reacted in our support on Kashmir in as much as it should have. But then, these are still early days. The world is changing. India is changing. I think, the hon. Prime Minister has been to USA at a very, very significant stage when we are gathering strength. And USA, in spite of these nice words which are there in the Joint Statement, is apprehensive of us. The USA is apprehensive of us. They are not comfortable with the fact that we have become a nuclear power. This is something that we must cash in on, without being abrasive, or, without using aggressive language. We should cash in on this. Our capabilities are developing. We are now a growing nation and I don't think we should always look at the disadvantages that are accruing to us through this treaty. Now, there is this fear being expressed about the background factor which has never been stated, which cannot be stated, and which should not even be mentioned in this House. We are always thinking as if USA is going to use us to further its own progress. We are a powerful nation on our own, and we are growing. Is it possible that we are using USA to further our interests? Is it possible, if not now, maybe in the future? We have criticised this treaty, this agreement, this statement that has been made in the USA. Have we in any of our meetings, even mildly, criticised the China-Pakistan relationship? Have we done it even mildly? Have we criticised even mildly the new defence treaty China has entered into with Bangladesh? We are now standing on our own feet and, I think, that these are factors that we have to keep in our mind and, I think the hon. Prime Minister has done a very admirable job at this stage under these changing circumstances which we ourselves are hesitant to acknowledge. I think he had a very challenging job, a very senstive job and I personally think he has fulfilled this mission very admirably, he has fulfilled it in a very nice manner. And I think he deserves our compliments.

DR. BIMAL JALAN (Nominated): Sir, I am non-specialist. I know very little about the sujbect under discussion. I was not going to speak on this at all. But I do believe that today's debate has been extraordinarily good and, therefore, I thought I will probably try and give you a citizen

perspective who is a non-specialist, who does not want to read the Joint Statement very carefully but who has gone through this debate and has come to certain conclusions.

Mr. Chairman, Prime Minister's statements in Lok Sabha and in Rajya Sabha--I have read it; I was not here; I was somewhere else---were excellent and brilliant. I also regard Shrimati Sushma Swaraj's statement today as one of the most brilliant speeches that I have heard. She was extremely eloquent, rhetorical and, I think, it was one of the best speeches. She made points--which might be right or wrong; it did not matter--which were extremely cogent. Shri Nilotpal Basu also made a very excellent speech and so on and so forth. So, this is one of the best debates that I have heard.

Not, where I come out of all this is really that it is not the question of whether US is good or US is bad, or, India is great or India is not so great. The issue really is this. What are India's interests, and whether the kind of agreement that we have had contributes to furthering that interest, if nothing goes wrong. Now, it seems to me that there are three points on which we all agree, India's strategic interest is paramount and, on that, there is no disagreement. The second is that we need nuclear fuel. On that also, there can be no disagreement. The third which is vital, is that if there is a conflict between India's strategic interest and India's getting nuclear fuel, we will abide by our strategic interest. So, on that there can be no difference of view. So, where do I come out? I listened to Dr. Alexander, and he made very useful points as to what used to happen before. I listened to Sushma Swaraj Ji and other speakers. They made very important points. And I don't think we should ignore them. But, where do you come out? Where I come out is, essentially, in our present situation, this statement to me is authoritative. If the Prime Minister of India tells the House that there is nothing in the Joint Statement that amounts to limiting or inhibiting our strategic nuclear weapons' programme, over which we will retain unrestricted, complete autonomous control; if the Prime Minister of India tells me that reciprocity is the key to the implementation all the steps enumerated in the Joint Statement, I would go by that statement, and the reason is simply this. Let us say that the American interpretation of that Joint Statement is different. Then we have the right also to give it up, we also have the right to depart. If they have the right to let us down, we have the right not to abide by that. He said this is our understanding. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would say, given this statement--I am not saying that Sushmaji is wrong at all, her fears may be right--but there is nothing which

prevents India to do what United States did to you in 1982, about which Dr. Alexander told you. Well, if it is not in our strategic interest, if it is not in our national interest, if it is not something we want, if it is not reciprocal and it is not something that we can live with, then, we don't have to go ahead. We will say,"We don't agree", even in 2020 or 2025, the next generation to which we all have been referring to.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say that by and large, on this particular issue, let us confine ourselves to this statement, and it is up to interepretation, it is up to the future generation. If you don't like it, what happens? If they don't abide by their agreement, we will also not abide by ours. Why not? India is not aid-dependent; India is not poor; India is not down and out. India is a strong and great country. Thank you very much.

KUMARI NIRMALA DESHPANDE (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir; I don't wnat to repeat what my friends have already said. I would just like to place, through you, before this August House that we are living in a fast-changing world, and old mindsets and fast-changing new world do not go together. The whole concept of national security is changing everyday. And, it is not just the weapons, both the conventional and nuclear, that will make a country secure, but it is the people of that country, the will of the people, happy, well-fed, contended and people with a mission, that is the best guarantee of security.

Sir, I would also like to place before you, and through you, before this August House that today the whole world is changing so fast that before the bombing started in Iraq, there were huge peace marches all over the world. Millions and millions of people came out on the streets to say, 'Say yes to peace, no to war and no blood for oil'. When the huge peace march, with a million people organised in New York, it was snowing the temperature was below freezing point. I would like to say proudly that our Prime Minister's youngest daughter was walking with the peace activists. That is the new world, the emerging world. The New York Times had to write in its editorial that after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, only one super-power was left. But, now another super power is emerging and that is the world public opinion.

Sir, before I conclude, I would just like to say that the new slogan for an emerging world is, 'People of the world unite for peace'. Thank you, *Jai Jagat.*

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I don't want to test the patience of the House. Sir, I should be guided as to how many minutes I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only ten minutes. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I am mindful of the mood of the House and I am also mindful of the fact that this is now the end of what I think has seen a well-informed debate, both in this House and in the other. I have attempted to follow it as best as I could in that House as well. Because I am also, possibly, the last speaker on this occasion before the Prime Minister responds, I will endeavour to say what I have to within ten minutes. Most issues have already been covered in the two Houses and it will be very difficult for me to identify such issues as have not been. But I will, nevertheless, request the Prime Minister to attend to some of the questions, aspects, that I here submit for his consideration. I also have a sense as if this is a continuing debate. In one sense, perhaps, it is, and has been going on now for the last six-seven years, with only the prinicpal actors of it having exchanged their places. I am quite struck by the opinions being expressed now and the claims that are made by the Treasury Benches. Just the other day, you were all engaged in deriding whatever we were doing. What is also very clearly manifested both here and in the United States of America is that like with any successful continuity, of any policy, a whole host of paternity disputes have suddendly cropped up. There are paternity disputes about this policy between the Republicans and the Democrats. And I witness a similar phenomenon in our country too. I endeavour, therefore, to remain beyond the paternity disputes. But I must make a brief mention of some of the interventions of hon. Members, the speakers on behalf of the Treasury Benches, particularly the Congress Party. The opening speaker representing immaculate misconception ranged far and wide, Sir, and with considerable originality went back to those hardy perpetuals of Kandhar and even went calling on the East Coast of the U.S., or Mr. Talbot. The interest that subsequent speakers also showed in the theme, after the first speaker informed us very candidly that the hon. Minister of External Affairs has continued to be generous in distributing that book, adequately and properly marked by his officers so that the participants, or, the interventionists do not have difficutly in opening the relevant pages. That is an easy way to intervene to deal with the pre-occupations of the ruling party as also of the hon. Minister for External Affairs. Whenever you so choose, Sir, whatever queries or doubts that they have, if they are listed once and for all, it will perhaps facilitate the business of the House, and our continuing with other activities. I must also compliment the Members of the Communist Party Marxists...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: With due respect, I want one clarification from you. Since you have referred to what I have quoted from the book, earlier in this House there was a question to that effect by me. But until now, we are yet to hear any refutation from your side. Since this book has been published by somebody whom you had engaged then. He has quoted you very generously and extensively. We would be benefited if you could clarify.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am, Sir, flattered by this consistent and continuing preoccupation that the Treasury Benches have, both with me as a person, as also with a distinguised member of the then U.S. Administration, with whom I had the pleasure of interacting and I did have the pleasure of being a friend of. Sir, I commend the hon. Members of the Marxist Party for that sharp insight by which they caught on to the assertions of patriotism by the ruling party and accordingly jingoism because we saw a very good demonstration of it, both by the first speaker from the Congress Party as also the subsequent second speaker in a very loud voice even though the acoustics here in the House and the system of enhancement of voice are quite adequate, quite efficient. We were informed in extremely loud voices of the great patriotism that they represent. I was very impressed by the voice, I must admit. ...*(Interruptions)*... There was a competition. I am not a part of that competition. But I must say, Sir, that my sympathies are with the Marxist Party because whenever they go into their policy pronouncements, to me, at least, it feels as if they are caught in a revolving door of confusion. So, sometimes that revolving door faces that way and then we speak in a certain fashion. May I go a little autobiographical, Sir, and I would not take long. I was discussing this particular aspect with a Member of Parliament of the other House, who is a friend of mine, Sir, more than actually a friend, and I cited to him that in 1962 I was in uniform. And in 1962, as it happened, as fate would have it, I was in the North-East. In 1962, what happened is well enough known. A statement was then issued by the Communist Party in Calcutta that the People's Republic of China had not committed any aggression upon India and it was not an aggression. I do believe, Sir, that the Communist Party of India (Marxist) has not found it necessary to change that view up till now. I make this mention to the great patriotic party that...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: (West Bengal) Sir, I have a point of order. Sir, our Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business make it very clear that a Member who is speaking cannot really give misleading information. The statement of the Communist Party that he is referring to never said

that the Communitst Party at that point in time said that China was not aggressor. It said that it is a border dispute and it should be peacefully settled across the table. I believe the history has absolved the Commuist Party and ultimately it has been the official stand of the Governments subsequently, including the Government, which he participated.....(*Interruptions*)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be a ....(*Interruptions*).... It is not a point of order.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: ये हाउस को मिसलीड कर रहे हैं, अब तक तो मैं सुन रहा था।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will not be misled. ....(*Interruptions*).... I am sure you will not be misled ....(*Interruptions*).... I know you very well. ....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: It is factually not correct ....(*Interruptions*)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. ....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, is he replying to the debate? The discussion is on the statement of the Prime Minister. Mr. Chairman, Sir, have you given hime the responsibility for summing up the debate? I want to know whether he is seeking clarification on the Prime Minister's statement or he is summing up the debate, which he used to do when he was on this side of the House. He is not there now. He is the Leader of the Opposition and not a Minister summing up a debate ....(*Interruptions*).... I would like to have a discussion on this issue. ....(*Interruptions*)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given him the permission ....(*Interruptions*).... Please go ahead.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, you please check up the proceedings and if there is anything factually incorrect, I would request you to please expunge it.

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, ठीक है।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think this is yet another example of being caught in the revolving door of policies. ....(*Interruptions*).... May I also cite, autobiographically, that when in 1964 when the Lap Nor Test tookplace, by then the Communist Parties had separated and the first reaction from the CPI, if I recollect right, Sir, then was, Sir, that this

was not acceptable, because,otherwise; this will encourage counter revolutionaries and the right wing reactionaries to take similar action. The CPM then welcomed this Lap Nor Test and said that this will lead to stability. They said it would lead to stability. What is a matter of some interet to me is the CPM, which sits as an ally in office and governance of that great patriotic party of India which now finds difficulty.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I make this point absolutely clear. We do not need a certificate of patriotism from anybody like Shri Jaswant Singh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not issuing a certificate to you. This is not in the form of a certificate. Please take your seat. ....*(Interruptions)*....

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, आपने इन्हें कितना टाइम दिया है बोलने के लिए, 15 मिनट तो हो गए हैं।

†جناب شاہد صدیقی : سر، آپ نے انہیں کتنا ٹائم دیا ہے بولنے کے لئے۔ 15 منٹ تو ہو گئے ہیں۔

श्री सभापति: इन्हें बोलने दीजिए ....(**व्यवधान**)....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: That is what he is doing. Nobody is interested in .....*(Interruptions)* ... rumblings. सर, हम नोटिस दे देंगे, हिस्टरी ऑफ कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के ऊपर डिबेट होगी, कोई प्रॉब्लम नहीं है ....(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री सभापति: मैं इसे देख लूंगा, don't worry -----.(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठिए.... (**व्यवधान**).... इन्हें बोलने दीजिए, बैठ जाइए ....(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I sometimes think, Sir, that ....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I will give a notice. We can have a discussion on that.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: You are allowing him to discuss about the Communist Party. Is it the subject of our discussion? *(Interruptions)* Partiotism ....*(Interruptions)*... Then, I will talk about the RSS.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: आपकी पार्टी को आरएसएस चलाता है ....(**व्यवधान**)....

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: आपको भी चीन और रूस चलाता है ....(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री सभापति: बैठ जाइए, जसवन्त सिंह जी, आप शुरू कीजिए ....(**व्यवधान**).... सब लोग बैठ जाइए ....(**व्यवधान**).... प्लीज़, आप बोलिए ....(**व्यवधान**)....

†Transliteration in Urdu Script.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: ये भारतीय जनता पार्टी और आरएसएस बोलें तो ठीक है, दूसरे बोलें तो कहते हैं कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के ऊपर चर्चा हो रही है ....(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री सभापति: आप इन्हें बोलने दीजिए ....(**व्यवधान**).... आप बोलिए।

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: He did not have the courage to initiate the debate. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: If he had spoken in the beginning, I would have responded. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. (*Interruptions*) Please take your seat. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: It is a social cultural organisation. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I do agree with you that a lot of these manifestations are on account of a very deep knowlede of foreign policy. Sir because for them 'sinal is the plural of sinus'. Therefore, we see a manifestation like this. The substance of today's debate is not technical, not so much now, because the technicalities of what is the substance what is the statement, what the hon. Prime Minister has engaged himself with in the joint statement. I believe, as an individual, because I am not technically qualified, not even having a formal degree. Having gone to the Army at the age of 15 virtually, therefore I cannot...

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY: I am also from the Army,

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: You do also. But you claim to have a degree. Sir, my learned colleague was my senior in the Academy and ragged me a very great deal when I reached the Academy, (*Interruptions*) but I have not taken any revenge on that. So far as the issue, Sir, beyond the paternity disputes that are applicable to the Republicans and the Democrats and the two of us here, in India, I submit that a very eminent jurist recognised the significant aspects of this Joint Statement had also recognised that there is a sentence there which admits clearly that it is the 'conclusion of the NSSP 2004', which is marked by the hon. Prime Minister's visit. There is significance in that. And that significance is of continuity. That is the aspect I want to add. Continuity does not mean conformity. There is a continuity of the broad approach of policies. It is entirely possible, Sir, had we not fallen behind by about seven seats in the May of 2004, then, perhaps, my distinguished friend, Mr. Yashwantji or hon. Vajpayeeji, could have arrived at different formulation. But, then, this is in the realm of speculation.

To my mind, I have a different set of issues here which otherwise I would have shared with you. I think, we would be well advised to not attempt to separate two definitive aspects of nuclear security as also energy security. It is not an easy task. They are inter-related and we ought not to get to involved in the technical or other semantics of it. That is my first thought that I would leave with the hon. Prime Minister.

So far as nuclear power is concerned, I think, this is a very significant aspect. I just want to take a minute to share the figures of global nuclear power production which is today is around 367,000-odd MW. Of that total global power production, which is out of 440 nuclear plants, India has only 15 nuclear plants and our total nuclear power production is less than 3,000 MW. I do not go here into the exact figure. We had announced--I remember inhabiting these very corridors for over a quarter of a century now, either here or in the other House,--a target. I remember very well discussing the target of 10,000 MW by 2000 AD. It is not something that I cite to the Prime Minister as a point of criticism. I do think that it is a point of collective concern that if against that announcement of 10,000 MW, we have reached barely 3,000 MW and already half a decade--beyond 2005--we have to sit up and take a very serious note. By all means, examine the relative merits or demerits of various energy options. Hon. leaders of the Communist Party cited that they are opposed to stockpiling. I am sure, he knows, Sir, that between Russia and the People's Republic of China and the USA, the total number of strategic warheads that can be launched is in excess of 5,500. So, the concern about stockpiling is very different and it has to be very differently aimed at. It has to be voiced at different quarters. On this energy, there is no disputing the fact that we need it. As NDA we were fully committed to find every possible option. Even before the NDA, Sir, I had a conviction in my mind that there has to be an expansion of energy sources. And, we are an energy-hungry country. What we started with Iran, which my distinguished friend, Shri Yashwant Sinha, continued, I am very glad that the UPA is also continuing with it. And, the present Minister for Energy is applying himself to it with dedication and commitment. There may be difficulties. Of course, there are difficulties. But unless India has energy; unless we have the needed electric power, we will not have water, we will not have industrial production, we will not be able to run our hospitals. I don't wish to paint a picture of dire consequences. But that is the reality. And, in that sense, we have no difficulty if the pursuit is of energy security. And this is one of the options that we do have. Some cautions them to share with the hon. Prime Minister.

5.00 P.M.

When pursuing this, do examine what we say, as far as cautions and concerns go. You have a team, you have very able officers to help you in this regard. I have, for long, felt that the international global order is no longer a international global order. It has been in a state of flux. It is in a state of flux, or, is it in a state of restructuring? This is a question of very great importance to India. If we do not answer it correctly, and if we stay on the side of those who subscribe to the fact that the international nuclear order is disintegrating, and India is one of the causes of it, I don't think that is in India's interest. If India is not one of the problems, then India has and is apart of the solution, that is the approach that we endeavoured to have under Mr. Vajpayee, when we were in the NDA government. And, that, I do believe, Sir, is the broad approach of the present Government as a whole. So far as the approach is concerned, I still have a little difficulty. But, in this, let us be clear whether it is a state of disorder, or, it is a state of restructuring. One more thought is here, that is, the existing control mechanism that is put in place, but no longer operational. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, now, is full of holes. The CTBT, of course, is non-starter. The CTBT died the day you did not accept to vote for it. That is, therefore, a debate that has ended. But, as a consequence, even though the NPT is full of holes, the fact remains that some of the by-products of the NPT continue to inhabit not only the nuclear world, but also our nuclear vocabulary. And, our continued subscription to that vocabulary, adherence to the requirements of the by-products of the NPT is a questionable path to follow. And, it is under that, that I wish to share some specific aspects. I won't go into the details of those because I don't have the time. I have a number of other significant issues which I would have otherwise shared with the Government. But I don't think I have the time. Let us recognize that we are dealing with a world in which hegemony is, today, the global order. And that hegemony is of the United States of America. That is the reality. The United States of America is the single largest military power that the human history has seen. It is also an industrial power. The fabric of its economic structure is beginning to sag. But, for the time being, that is the reality that we have to deal with. How do you manage that power? How do you manage the hegemonistic power of today, in this globe, that is a challenge to our diplomatic finesse. Out of that challenge, Sir, arises, how you address this very important issue which is both, of security as also of energy security that the country has. Please also recognise, in addressing this issue, that no hegemony, no global hegemonic power has been a permanent power. This is a transient power. Even in the 20th Century, we have seen the rise and fall of great powers. Recognise that this is a

transient power. The United States of America is not a permanent reality. The transient period is very difficult to predict. In this period, the policy has to be structured to the best advantage of India. Sir, there are questions that in this state of flux and disorder, in a world that is also disoriented in consequence, please recognise that the non-proliferation debate is not over. That non-proliferation dabate will re-emerge. The questions that we think we have already answered, will re-emerge, and the NPT might be full of holes now, you might feel that we have answered these queries, but I recommend to the Government that you readdress them and constantly add this as a factor to be borne in mind. There is also the factor, I do believe that the Government is mindful of it, of nuclear resources, whether for peaceful or for military purposes, and the factor of the presence of terrorism not only on our soil, but in our vicinity, in our neighbourhood. Terrorism and nuclear resources are like fire and fuel being put together. There are perils in it, which India has not always addressed sufficiently. I leave that there. Sir, just two or three thoughts about the nature of the US Foreign Policy. Please take note that the US Foreign Policy is cyclical. It has a four-year cycle. Of those four years, for about the first two years, the United States of America formulates policy, takes initiatives, and for the next two years, they then get engaged with re-election. Now, we don't have that much time because that is the reality, that is the nature of their democracy. This is not a value judgement, it is factor that has to be taken into account when we consider serious initiatives like the present one. In this four years—two years cycle of US Foreign Policy, what is the situation today in United States of America? What is the reality?

Sir, the United States, today, is a divided country. I have never known the US as divided internally as it is today. Please take into account this as a factor that will influence the policy of the Republican Government that is in office today. That will, certainly, influence when it comes for these issues to be considered with the help of the US media which is very active. And, at times, I wonder, in this competition, which is the more irresponsible or more aggressive, the US or ours? The media and the policy-makers, believe me, Sir, are not all in tune with the ruling establishment and that also is a factor that will influence future of our policy. I leave it for you. The United States, of which we are strategic partners now, and with which we have concluded this agreement, as also the military aspect, has different priorities in our own region, in our neighbourhood, in Afghanistan, in Iraq and Pakistan. As those differences are geopolitical, they have strategic implications for our future. That is a very important factor. I do not wish, Sir, to go into

quoting because there is the additional protocol, for example, of the IAEA. It requires anything between 24 to 2 hours' notice within which inspection can take place. I am sure, the Government knows that the IAEA has now the satellite surveillance method. I wish the satellite will not only access the movement of fuel from the mine to the processing plants, but even outside. These are factors that have to be taken into account.

Also, Sir, about the MTCR and about the Nuclear Suppliers' Group, I am sure, the Government has taken note that the Nuclear Suppliers' Group was established by the United States of America as a reaction to the peaceful nuclear explosion of India in 1974. Please don't forget that central aspect of the Nuclear Suppliers' Group plus also the reality of what the MTCR is. I cite you an anomaly. Russia is a member of the MTCR, but China is not. Russia is a member, but the former adherant to the Soviet empire are not. These are very important aspects for us to bear in mind, and take into account. When the agreement speakes, Sir, jointly--I can't remember the exact words--about the conjoined responsibilities or obligations that arise from the MTCR plus the Nuclear Suppliers' Group, the NSG, then what does that involve for us? It is not a simple menu that is being served, and so far as the additional IAEA document that we have to sign, be mindful, Sir, of what we have said. It is time, I agree with my friends, to reflect on what is being done, not necessarily, I think, as my distinguished friends here or some of you there, would like to. We will work with you, Sir, for the benefit of the country, but you will have to convince us that what you are doing is for the benefit of the country. We want to work towards a consensus, but a consensus, Sir, is not simply giving you our consent. You have to also obtain our consensus. Consensus is not simply conforming to your views. We have endeavoured to do it. We will do it again. Sir, it has been a very good debate, I think, in both the Houses, and I am very grateful to my Party that it has given me a chance to participate in it.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: सर, मेरा सिर्फ एक ही सवाल है कि यह पेरेंटल कन्फ्यूज़न में कोई मिसकैरिज न हो जाए।

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and given their assessment and valuable suggestions regarding the outcome of my visit to the United States.

Sir, before I go ahead and analyse the various issues that have emerged in the debate, I would like to submit to this House that one particular

charge that Shrimati Sushma Swaraj levied against our Government of not consulting the relevant fora is simply not true. Before I went to the United States, I had the privilege of inviting Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Shri L.K. Advani and Shri Jaswant Singh, and I laid before them what objectives I had. I had clearly mentioned to them my objective in this visit as far as the nuclear policy is concerned--to preserve and maintain our independence and autonomy in the management of strategic assets and, at the same time, open up new pathways to cooperation, to enhance India's energy security. Jaswant Singhji would recall in that discussion that there was a discussion about the management of nuclear power programme. We agreed that India's nuclear power programme was facing difficulties, not because our scientists lacked expertise, but because of the inequitable restrictive regimes that various powers had adopted, to deny India access to technologies and other associated facilities, which would enable us to leapfrog in the race for social and economic development, so that we can accelerate the tempo of social and economic change and get rid of chronic poverty, which still afflicts millions and millions of our people.

Sir, I had mentioned to hon. Atalji, Advani ji and Jaswant Singh ji precisely the framework which I followed while I was in Washington. I was also privileged to have the benefit of consultations with our colleagues from the Left Parties and I did give them the same briefing, which I did to the Members of the NDA. After coming back, before making the statement in the House, I also requested Atal ji, Advani ji and Jaswant Singh ji to do me the honour of sitting with me, so that we could jointly appraise and analyse what we have achieved and what we have not achieved. I was very privileged that they did accept my invitation. I did the same thing with regard to our Left colleagues.

Therefore, Sir, within the limits of possibilities, all relevant steps were taken by us to keep the main cross-currents of political opinion within our country--the leaders of the Opposition, the leaders of the Left and our Alliance--fully informed of what we were going to do before going, and what we did after we came back.

Sir, several points have been raised here. Sushma ji referred to the statement of a particular American official, Mr. Nicholas Burns. She preferred to believe him rather than me. I think the choice was entirely hers. But I do hope, I am right in saying that she and her friends have greater confidence in Mr. Strobe Talbott. She should also quote what he has been writing about what our Government has done in Washington. Mr. Talbot's comments are exactly in the opposite direction; that too much has been conceded to

India, that the nuclear order will collapse because President Bush has made extraordinary concessions to India. I am not going to say who is right and who is wrong. I think I leave this judgement to the hon. leaders of the Opposition. My purpose today is, through this House, to inform our country what I set out to achieve and how far I have successful in achieving that. The purpose, the basic thrust, of all policies of our country, as I see it, is to set in motion processes which would enable us to leap-frog in the race of social and economic change so that we can get rid of chronic poverty which still afflicts millions and millions of our people. After India became independent, great progress was made in all directions. But, the task of getting rid of poverty, to which Panditji committed our nation on the 15th August, 1947, is still not complete. When I presented my first Budget as Finance Minister in 1991, I had then referred to both Houses of Parliament, quoting Victor Hugo, that no power on earth can stop an idea whose time had come, and I had then suggested to this august House, and the other House, that the emergence of India as a major global power happens to be one such idea whose time has come and that is the goal that our Government has sought to work on to realise. Whether we have succeeded or not, it cannot be realised in one go, but that is the mission, that is the ambition, and India's foreign policy has to contribute to preservation and strengthening of national security and also to widen our development options. We live in a world which is not a world which we like in all respects. Yet, it is a fact that inter-dependence of nations is a reality. And that in this inter-dependent world, there is such a thing as power relations. This power in the world is not distributed equally, and we know, through history, that where there is inequality of power and international relations are fundamentally power relations—those who are more powerful cannot resist the temptation to coerce those who are weak. The United States is today a pre-eminent power. It is a super-power. It has global interest. In many areas, those interests do not coincide with our interests. Our ambition is to work to create a more just international system, a world which will be moving more towards multi-polarity; at the same time, to take advantage of the opportunities that exist in the present system to achieve our goals of acceleration the pace of social and economic change. We are not saying that this multi-polar world can become reality overnight, but we have a contribution to its realisation and that can be done only by making India a strong pole of the global economy. Therefore, my first effort has been to use whatever opportunities that exist in the present system, to take advantage of those to move India into a high growth path. Our country today is admired all over the world. We have the second highest

growth rate in the world and what is more significant is that the world today marvels and respects India for what we are - a country of one billion people with great diversity of beliefs, of religions and yet, seeking its salvation in the framework of a democratic polity committed to all fundamental human freedoms and respect for the dignity of the individual. Therefore, there are opportunities in this unequal system that we have to contend with, and, I sincerely believe working with the United States to explore areas of convergence of interests is in our national interest. This does not mean that we endorse everything that the United States does, but in an interdependent world in which the United States counts for what you all know, we have to do business, and, therefore, my effort has been in this visit to help create an international environment which is more supportive of India's development efforts and which in the process widens our development options.

Excessive discussion has taken place on the nuclear issue. My first thought when I thought of visiting the United States was not on the nuclear issue. I was worried about the state of India's agriculture. The previous Government prepared the Tenth Five Year Plan. It has a target of four per cent growth rate of agriculture. We are nowhere in sight. Our agricultural economy seems to have reached a plateau where new technologies associated with the Green Revolution, which came about in the mid-sixties and seventies, seem to have lost their old dynamism. And therefore I thought this is an opportunity to use the tremendous advances in human knowledge, in bio-technology and related fields to see if we can revitalise our research institutions, our agricultural universities, our extension centres, and that is what is reflected in the Joint Statement and I attach great importance to its role in modernising and expanding the horizons for India's agricultural economy. Therefore, please do not concentrate only on the nuclear issue.

Then, there are these tremendous infrastructure bottlenecks. The tragedy of Mumbai is very much before us. How inadequate infrastructure has created such a human misery in this premier financial capital of our country. This could happen to any other city. We have been very negligent of infrastructure management. I have calculated that we need at least $ 150 billion worth of investment in the next seven or eight years if we have to modernise our infrastructure, if we have to realise our ambitions of moving on to a growth rate of eight to ten per cent. Our domestic savings rate is respectable, but we need international help and the United States can help us. Therefore, when I discussed this idea first with President Bush

when I met him in Moscow, he said that the American Government is no longer in the aid business but whatever we can do to encourage US business to take greater interest in India, I will work with you. He said, I will put 5 of my best friends who are in the world of business to work with 5 of your top businessmen and let them jointly explore as to how our two countries can work better to realise your vision of a more dynamic infrastructure. I attached great importance to that aspect of my work in Washington. When I was in Washington, three of our top meteorological scientists, led by Dr. Shukla, came to me and said, "India's meteorological systems require a sea-change, if we are to take advantage of what is happening on the frontiers of relevant scientific subjects". This is not only in meteorological matters that we need upgradation of our skills. Our scientists have done very well. We are proud of their achievements. But human knowledge is increasing at a pace which was unthinkable even ten years ago. Therefore, we need increased contact between the academic institutions, research institutions and between the scientists of our two countries. And, fortunately, there are today, in all major US research centres, whether you go to the IBM laboratory or you go any University, bright young Indians are operating on the frontiers of the knowledge. I think this is the brain reservoir we must tap. And, during this visit, it was my effort to tap that potential reservoir for our country, and that is an aspect which I would like to emphasise. We have reached an agreement, a Framework Agreement, on science and technology development in frontier areas. The United States now recognises India as a space leader. I hope possibilities of cooperation will occur which will do us credit. This was yet another aspect of my work and what we achieved is mentioned in the joint statement. But I was always conscious of the fact that if India is going to become a major growth pole of the evolving world economy, if we have to achieve every year 8 to 10 per cent growth rate, we would require the growth of commercial energy in our country, at least, at the same rate as our GDP growth. In fact, in our country, the demand for commercial energy is going to increase at a much faster pace. Why do I say this? Because, in our country, two revolutions are taking place simultaneously. At one hand, under the impact of modernisation, the subsistence rural economy is shrinking. Therefore, old traditional ways of meeting energy, firewood, household fuels, they are giving place to the increasing demand even in the rural sector for modern commercial energy. And, secondly, as we grow, as we industrialise, as we urbanise, there is that increase in demand for commercial energy. Therefore, India's energy security, along with the security of our water resources and security of our food, I think, is a critical

determinant of what happens to the Indian economy in the next 25 years. Now, if we are going to work for energy security, what are we going to do? We have plentiful reserves of coal. We today produce about 400 million tonnes of coal and calculations are that the demand for coal will increase over a thousand million tonnes by the year 2010. More production of coal must take place. But with it come consequences for the environment, the CO_2 emissions. I mean, if, in due course of time, the international climate change regime comes about, this could come a cropper. Therefore, we cannot put all the eggs in the basket of coal, though we work to develop clean coal technology. That is one area of priority, which is recognised in thsi Joint Statement.

Today, we cannot do without hydrocarbons. For 70 per cent of our consumption of hydrocarbons today, we are dependent on imported supplies. I hope peace prosperity prevails in the West Asia. But who can ignore all these uncertainties, leave aside other uncertainty? We are witnessing this year the uncertainty, instability and unpredictability of the oil prices. They have tripled in the last five or six months. So, we must, therefore, explore other options.

The resolution which led to the establishment of our Atomic Energy Commission—and, our country will be eternally grateful to Panditji for having the vision to recognise the role of science and technology, particularly atomic energy, in managing the future needs of our country—laid the greatest emphasis on the use of atomic power for generation of electricity. I think Jaswant Singhji mentioned our ambitions in this regard.

I was a Member of the Atomic Energy Commission, when I was Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, way back in the 1970's. At that time, we had prepared a plan to reach the target of 10,000 Megawatts for nuclear capacity. We are today 30 years away from that period. Our total capacity is about 3000 Megawatt. In the next five or six years, it can at best rise to about 6,000 Megawatt. But, even for these, we do not have fuels. We have problems in mining uranium in the areas where domestic deposits are found. As far as imported fuel is concerned, once again, because of the restrictive international regime which the United States and other countries have erected we are not able to access those sources or supplies.

Therefore, it was my ambition to use this visit to make an earnest effort to get this restrictive, repressive and inequitable regime—which for 35 years had stood as an obstacle in our race to leapfrog in the race for social and economic development by use of high technology—out of the way.

If we want energy security, we have to rely more on nuclear energy. All over the world, nations like Japan and France, which are short of raw materials, reply heavily on nuclear energy. I do believe that which we must develop coal, we must develop hydropower; we must develop renewable sources of energy to widen our development options for the future; and we must have an equal access to commercial energy, which is environment-friendly. Sir, Jaswant Singhji referred to the international nuclear order. It is in a state of flux. You may call it disorder. I am not good at analyzing long-term trends. But that there is a flux, nobody can deny. The NPT exists, but we all know, for example, the loopholes that exist and how despite the NPT, proliferation has taken place in our own neighbourhood. I could not, in the present stage, ask President Bush or the US Government that they should remove all restrictions on trade in nuclear assets. They said that there is such a thing as 'civilian' and there is such a thing as 'military'; we are willing to help you to augment your energy resources for your development, but military purposes are another kettle of fish. I had to reckon with that reality and, therefore, I had to evolve our approach, taking into account the realities of the world order. And the world order being whatever it is, I was clear in my mind that we shall do nothing which will, in any way, compromise our independence with regard to the management of security.

And despite the doubts that had been sought to be cast by Sushmaji, I assure this House that I am satisfied that those doubts are not based on facts. It is true that what the US President has stated will require Congressional assent. It is also a fact that at my instance, President Bush has agreed that he will use the US influence with US allies and other countries also to dismantle these repressive regimes. And that applies also to the Nuclear Suppliers' Group to make concessions in favour of India. What the US Congress will do, I cannot predict. But if you read the Joint Statement, it is clearly stated after the US position is stated, what are our commitments. The starting sentence of that refers to all these commitments are to be interpreted in reciprocity. If there is no action taken by the United States Government or if the US Congress does not agree with the US President, we are completely free, for example, to stay where we are. We are not required to do anything. The separation of civilian nuclear facilities and military facilities, I have been told by our nuclear establishment, can be done. I have not studied the details, but competent observers have told me that the Father of India's Nuclear Programme, Dr. Raja Ramanna, himself had proposed long ago, that such a division should be made. Our nuclear establishment has told me that this can be done,

but it will have to be done in a phased manner. And, therefore, we put it to the US Government that this separation will be done in a phased manner. It will be an autonomous Indian decision as to what is 'civilian' and what is 'military'. Nobody outside will tell us what is 'civilian' and what is 'military'.

Therefore, Sir, I submit to this House that we have all the essential safeguards built into this Joint Statement which will ensure that India's autonomy and independence in the management of its nuclear assets is not compromised in any manner. Sir, what are the commitments that I have taken? I am very clear in my mind and I can assure the House that there is no secret appendage or secret agreement. Everything that I discussed with the President is faithfully stated. There is nothing more to our agreement than what is stated in this Joint Statement. Now, what are these commitments? First of all, there is a moratorium on nuclear tests. This was announced by the previous Government and we said that we would continue to do so. Then there is a commitment to work with the United States for the conclusion of a Multilateral Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. Sushmaji, I think, was skilled in pointing out quibbles about the words "together with", "working with", etc. I respectfully submit that there is no difference between the commitment that the previous Government made and what is stated in this Joint Statement.

Sir, the third is to ensure that necessary steps have been taken to secure nuclear materials and technology through comprehensive export control legislation and through harmonization and adherence to Missile Technology Control Regime and Nuclear suppliers' Group guidelines. Only a few weeks ago, this august House passed the necessary legislation which obliges us to ensure that our sensitive technologies do not get into the hands of unauthorized persons. So, there is no commitment, which is being taken, which is not there in the laws as approved by our Parliament. The only commitment that I have taken additionally is to agree to the separation of the military from the civil programme. There I have the support of the nuclear establishment. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission was with me. It is only after he was satisfied that this agreement protects all the essential interests that are dear to all of us, I signalled that we can go ahead with this agreement. I respectfully submit to you, Sir, that the arrangement, as it stands, is in our national interest. It preserves our autonomy of the management of strategic nuclear assets. Whatever the designs, whatever the contents of the nuclear weapon programme, that will continue to be exclusively the decision of the Government and the people of India.

As far as our nuclear programme is concerned, our scientists have done us proud by having mastered the complete fuel cycle. From Pressurised Heavy Water Reactors to Fast Breeders to Next Generation Reactors based on thorium, we will give them all possible facilities to realize this vast latent potential represented by the Indian science and technology in the US. So, there should be no doubt in anybody's mind that the nuclear programme, that our research effort, will suffer. There should be no doubt that our strategic asset programme will not remain exclusively in our own hand and, at the same time, we have the satisfaction that if what the President has promised me is really implemented by the Congress, we would have full equal status with regard to international trade in civilian nuclear facilities.

I think if that comes about, it will open up a few possibilities of the development of India's nuclear energy system. We have today because of a small nuclear energy sector, only small firms, high technology firms, in which we can take great pride. I take pride in the activities of the Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd. I take pride in the way Larsen and Tubro has managed the most modern technologies, and also Walchand Hirachand. But these are only small islands. If in the next 20-30 years our nuclear power programme increases and we have the ambition to aim at 30,000 to 40,000 megawatts of nuclear capacity in the next 20 years, I have a vision that this will bring about a new burst of creativity, a second industrial revolution based on high technology where we will find many more new firms mastering the complicated new technologies now operating on the frointiers of scientific knowledge and technology. Now Dr. P.C. Alexander said, "there are risks. US may not live up to what they promise." In life nothing is very certain, I think we have all to work on the assumption that things *ex post* may not turn out to be what they appear to be in sight. We must, therefore, take precautions. But not take risks would also be an act of lethargy. What is necessary is that we, as a nation, should take calculated risks. I submit to this august House that what we have done during our visit is, if there are risks, those are calculated risks; they are worth taking. While I am on subject, I would like to conclude by paying tribute to the team of officials who worked hard. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Kakodkar; the National Security Advisor, Mr. Narayanan; the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Shyam Saran; our Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Ronen Sen, all working actively under the guidance of my colleague, Shri Natwar Singh. I think they deserve our appreciation for what they have done.

With these words, Sir, I commend to this House that it should endorse what we have done in Washington. Thank you.

श्री सभापति: धन्यवाद, प्रधानमंत्री जी। सदन की कार्यवाही कल प्रात: 11 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at forty-eight minutes past five of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 5th August, 2005.

MGIPMRND—3039RS—02-01-2006.